



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Proceedings at Baltimore, October 26th and 27th, 1887.

THE Society assembled at 3 o'clock, Wednesday afternoon, in Hopkins Hall of the Johns Hopkins University. In the absence of the President, Professor Whitney, the conduct of proceedings was assumed by the Vice-President, Rev. Dr. Ward, of New York.

On motion, Professor Bloomfield, of Baltimore, was called to perform the duties of the Recording Secretary, Professor Lyon of Cambridge. The minutes of the May meeting were read and approved. For the Committee of Arrangements, President Gilman announced that the Society would continue in session until 5.30 P. M.; that the Thursday morning session would begin at 9.30 A. M.: and that the Directors had accepted for the Society an invitation to meet socially at his house in the evening (Wednesday), at 8 o'clock.

On behalf of the Directors, Professor Lanman, the Corresponding Secretary, gave notice that the next meeting would be held at Boston, on Wednesday, May 2, 1888, and that the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries would serve as a Committee of Arrangements.

On recommendation of the Directors, the following persons were elected :

As Honorary Members—

Professor Rāmkrishna Gopāl Bhāndārkar, of the Dekkan College, Poona, Bombay ;

Professor Georg Bühler, of the University of Vienna ;

Professor Franz Kielhorn, of the University of Göttingen ;

Bābū Rājendralāla Mitra, C. I. E., LL.D., of Calcutta ;

Raol Sahib Shankar Pāndurang Pandit, Official Interpreter to Government for the Bombay Presidency ;

Major-General Sir Henry C. Rawlinson, of London, Director of the Royal Asiatic Society ;

Professor Eduard Sachau, of the University of Berlin ;

Colonel Henry Yule, C. B., of London, Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society.

As Corresponding Member—

Dastur Jamaspji Minocheherji Jamasp Asana, of Bombay ;

And as Corporate Members—

Mr. William M. Arnolt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.;
Rev. Dr. Aaron S. Bettelheim, of the Hebrew Congregation of Baltimore;
Mr. George C. Howland, Irving Park, Chicago, Illinois;
Rev. Dr. Marcus Jastrow, Philadelphia, Pa.;
Mr. Herbert W. Magoun, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.;
Professor Ira M. Price, Morgan Park, Illinois;
Rev. Dr. Benjamin Szold, Baltimore, Md.;
Mr. William Cleveland Thayer, Baltimore, Md.;
Dr. Edward Freeman Underwood, Bombay Fort, Bombay.

The Corresponding Secretary laid before the Society some of the letters of the half-year. Mr. Rockhill, of the American Legation at Peking, writes under date of Sept. 8, 1887, enclosing a paper on the historical and commercial relations of Korea with China. He says: "While acting as U. S. Chargé d'Affaires in Korea in the latter part of last year and the early part of this, my attention was frequently called to the peculiar relations existing between the two countries and to the explanation given me of them by high Korean officials. On my return to China, I read what books I could find in Chinese on the subject, and the general results are in the paper I send you. . . . I am going off in a week to Wu t'ai shan and the Loess country on a month's trip. I hope I may see or hear of something which may prove of interest. Quite a number of books for the study of Chinese (Northern Mandarin) have appeared this year. The last, a new edition of Sir Thomas Wade's famous *Tzu-ehr chi*, is of course by far the best and will be the most generally used." He also encloses a clipping from the North China Daily News of Shanghai giving the results of the recent census, translated from a document emanating from the board of revenue. The total for fifteen provinces in 1885 is given as 319,383,500. And there were five provinces whose returns had not been received, but whose population cannot be much short of sixty millions. Mr. Rockhill thinks, however, that a grand total of 380 millions is considerably above the true figure.

Shankar P. Pandit writes from Mahābaleshvar, May 23, 1887, and sends a copy of his edition of the *Gaṭḍvaho*, a Prakrit poem by Vākpati, who lived in the last part of the seventh and the first part of the eighth centuries. The poem celebrates the glory of King Yaçovarman of Kanauj. The text is preceded by an elaborate critical and historical introduction. The editor writes again from Poona, Aug. 23, 1887, sending advance sheets of his quarto edition of the Atharva-veda, in the *samhitā* and *pada-pāthas*, and accompanied by the commentary of Sāyaṇa. The printed sheets go to page 704, including nearly to the end of the fourth *Kāṇḍa*. Sāyaṇa's quotations of the Kāuṣika-sūtra are often from memory or from a version different from ours,

Dr. A. V. Williams Jackson gives a pleasing report of the progress of the edition of the Avesta, which his teacher, Professor Geldner of Halle, is now publishing. The entire Yasna has already appeared. The fourth fascicle, containing Yashts 1-4, is ready; and the fifth fascicle, going to Yasht 10, is in type. The editor is now collating the MSS. in the Vendīdād.

Professor Lindner of Leipzig, after completing the translation of the Kāušitaki-brāhmaṇa, recently edited in the original by him, proposes to write a manual of the history of religions.

Professor Adolf Holtzmann of Freiburg in Baden writes that he is at work upon an introduction to the Mahā-bhārata. We may add that such a guide to the study of the vast poem is very much needed, and that in this task the author may be sure of the best wishes of his colleagues.

Professor I. H. Hall writes from New York that the pressing work of the Museum does not permit his attending the meeting. Apropos of the frequent mistakes in citing the name of the author of the work so indispensable to Syriac scholars, the "*Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*," Professor Hall writes in substance as follows: It was compiled by a Maronite monk named Joseph Simon Assemāni. The As-Semāni (or Is-Semāni) stands for Al-Semāni (or Il-Semāni). The literary Arabic form is Il-Semāniyū and means 'The Simeonite.' The full name, then, means 'Joseph Simon, of the family of Simeon.' Complete and consistent latinization would require us to write in the nominative Josephus Simon Assemanius (with only one *n*), as the English scholars sometimes do, or Assemanus, as he himself did. The form Assemani is at once the genitive of his latinized name and also the transcription of his name in Arabic.

President Gilman brought before the Society photographic copies of the manuscript of the "Teaching of the Apostles," recently sent to the Johns Hopkins University by the Patriarch of Jerusalem. The original MS. has been carried from Constantinople to Jerusalem, where it is now treasured. Fac-similes of the photographs will soon be published, with notes, under the editorial supervision of Professor J. Rendel Harris.

He also referred to a visit which he had recently made to the St. Ignatius mission in Montana, and called the Society's attention to a Dictionary (in two parts and more than a thousand pages) of the "Kalispel or Flathead Indian Language," printed at the mission by the Jesuit Fathers, between 1877 and 1879.

The following communications were presented:

1. On the significance of the Gāthās in the Avestā. Yasna 55.; by Dr. A. V. Williams Jackson (of Columbia College, New York City), now at the University of Halle, Germany; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

In considering the importance of the Gāthās and their relative position with reference to the rest of the Avesta, there arises the question of their age in comparison with the other portions of the book sacred

to the Zoroastrians ; for the age of these hymns as well as their character would have much to do with the estimation in which they were held.

It has been argued by some that the Gāthās are younger or at least not older than the great body of the Avesta (see de Harlez, *Av. trad.* Introd. p. 183 ff.; Spiegel, *Z.D.M.G.* xxxiii. 315); that Zoroaster was a mythical personage, and the Gāthās a priestly work of after times. The error of such a view has previously on different occasions been sufficiently proved, and it is not necessary now to speak of the means that have been employed to establish the antiquity of these hymns; nor is there opportunity just here to show the influence which the Gāthās have had upon the rest of the Avesta, an influence which pervades the whole; for in almost countless instances are found not quotations alone from these old anthems, but close imitations in phrases and words. This latter question will, it is hoped, be dealt with at some future time, as it will play an important part in overthrowing the argument advanced by some that such citations and references are due to interpolation. There is no need, moreover, now to recall the many arguments connected with the fact that in such passages the Gāthās are always spoken of with the reverence that age and merit had given them, a sanctity which showed how significant they had become to the followers of Zoroaster's teachings.

Sufficient it is to say that the main proof will be found within these hymns themselves. For if one will read in general aright the spirit that illuminates these compositions, the life that is there pictured, the personality and reality of Zoroaster as he moves among the people, there will then remain not a moment of doubt as to the Gāthās being anterior to all other parts of the Avesta and removed at considerable distance in time. The personal Zoroaster, the composer of these hymns, the founder of the religion, struggling to make his belief accepted, is a person far different from the being that in the Yashts had already become shadowy, almost enveloped with the cloud of myth, and far different again from the deified priestly functionary who in the Vendidad, in portions of the Yasna, and in the remainder of the Avesta, appears before us at the head of the religion there inculcated—a religion fully formed and which had long possessed its power. The Zoroaster of the Gāthās, the subjective hymns, is the true one; the Zoroaster of all other portions of the literature, the idealized development. It was time alone that had thrown the halo about him—such is ever the tendency, not the reverse.

Thus all the other parts of the literature, the objective parts we might say, in which the ideal Zoroaster plays the rôle, though their subject-matter may be older, must themselves necessarily be younger, far younger, than the Gāthās. It is in the Gāthās, then, and in the personal Zoroaster that we must look for the origin of the religion, and hence the importance of these old hymns, and the importance which they had for the Zoroastrians. To show further the estimation in which they were held in the Avesta, one prayer, Yasna lv., inserted after the last Gāthā, will be sufficient. It describes the true worth that characterizes the Gāthās, their significance to the worshippers of Mazda.

YASNA IV. A. TRANSLATION. 1. 'Our whole selves, our bodies, life and limb, our forms and forces, our consciousness, our soul and Fravashî, we offer and present; and we offer and present them to the holy sacred Gâthâs which have the power of Ratus.

2. 'The Gâthâs which exist for us as guardians and protectors and as spiritual sustenance, and which exist for our soul as food and raiment,—these Gâthâs are for us both guardians and protectors and spiritual sustenance, these are for our soul both food and raiment. May they be to us givers of good reward, rich reward, of the reward of Asha, for the life beyond the present after the separation of body and soul.

3. 'May these, the Staota Yesnya, Hymns of Worship, come to us with might and victory, come to us with health and healing, come with increase and with growth, with welfare and with mighty help, with goodness and with righteousness, come with concord and with love; as the most bounteous Mazda victorious, who furthers his beings, has produced them for protecting the beings of Asha, for guarding the beings of Asha, who are to be saved and who will save, and for guarding and protecting the whole existence of the righteous man.

4. 'Every righteous man that comes making his absolution with this in a benediction, mayest Thou (O Asha) credit with good thoughts, good words, good deeds.

5. 'We worship (therefore) Asha and Vohu Mano, we worship the holy sacred Gâthâs which have the power of Ratus.

6. 'The Staota Yesnya we worship, which are the precepts for the first life; which are memorized and put in use, which are learned and taught, which are kept in memory and practised, which are thought to one's self and recited aloud, which are worshipped, and which bring mankind in unity with Thy will.

7. 'The Chapter of the Staota Yesnya we worship, we worship the intoning, recital, singing, and sacrificial worship of the Staota Yesnya.' *Yēhē hātām*

B. COMMENTS. To 1. *gaēthaōs*, as derived from *g/ji* 'live' (compare Skt. *gaya*, Av. *gaya*, 1 *jī*) denotes 'beings, living creatures, family, household, possessions,' cf. Germ. 'Wesen, Anwesen.' Here *vīspaō gaēthaō* means 'our whole beings, ourselves,' and is distributed physically and spiritually in what follows. With *gaēthaōsca tanvasca* . . . *pairicā dademahī āca vaēdhayamahī*, compare the words of our Prayer Book: 'And here we offer and present . . . ourselves, our souls and bodies.' —*azdebīš* is here, as in Vd. vi.49, the instrumental plural neuter used as a general plural case. So also *nāmēnīš*, Yt. i.11, 16, 19, *imaō nāmēnīš dreñjayō framrava* 'these names after murmuring them pronounce;' and *asēbīš* in Yt. xiii.38, *khrūmaō asēbīš*

frazañta | *dānunām* *baēvare-paitinām* ‘cruelly are plundered (cf. Skt. *ḥyā*, *jināti*) the abodes of the Danus who have fallen by myriads.’ See also Bartholomae, *Arische Forschungen* i. p. 14; ii. p. 112; Geldner, *Drei Yasht* p. 136; *K.Z.* xxv. 585; xxvii. 225. —*uštānds*, in whatever way we may render it, can only mean ‘the vital principle,’ whether it be ‘life,’ or ‘soul’ in the sense of ‘the breath of life;’ it is the vital power, the physical life inherent in the body and lost at death (Vd. v. 9 et al.), in opposition to the immortal part of man. In one half of the total number of passages in which the word occurs, it is found in connection with *ast-*, lit. ‘bone,’ both being taken together to denote the human being. In the instance before us, the two mean ‘life and limb;’ of course in the original both words are in the plural and the order is reversed. In the same way we may render Ys. xii. 3 *nōiṭ astō nōiṭ uštānahē cinmāni* ‘attempts (acc. pl.) upon neither life nor limb;’ and Vd. v. 9 *ātarš hañdazhaiti asca uštānemca* ‘the fire consumes both life and limb.’ In comparison with the offering in our present passage, see Ys. xiii. 4 = xiv. 2 = Vsp. v. 2 *pairi-dadhāmi tanvasciṭ hvahyaō uštānem* ‘I give the life out of my very (*ciṭ*) body.’ —*baodhas*, *urvānem*, *fravašim*: these are three of the five elements of the soul which the faith of the Parsis acknowledges; the other two, *ahu* and *daēna*, completing the list, are found Ys. xxvi. 4 = Yt. xiii. 149. From the above we may, after Professor Geldner, construct the organism of man about as in the scheme tabulated on page ccxiv. In ordinary life, however, these concepts were not sharply distinguished; it should be remarked that Ahura Mazda has a *kerefš*, Ys. i. 1.

ratukhšathrābyō: this adjective, like the other compounds of *khšathra* (compare especially Vsp. xi. 1 *ahurāi mazdāi . . hu-khšathrāi . . ratukhšathrāi*) must mean ‘having *ratu*-power, having the quality of Ratus;’ the Gāthās being in Afr. ii. 3 and elsewhere each separately invoked as ‘chiefs, Ratus.’ Such is the meaning of the word also in Vd. xix. 38; Ys. lxxi. 11; Afr. ii. 1; and such, likewise, must be its signification in Yt. xxii. 18; Gāh iv. 9; Vsp. iii. 4. Thus Gāh iv. 9 *nāirikāmca* [*ašaonim*] *yazamaidē frāyō-humatām frāyō-hūkhtām frāyō-hvarštām huš-hām-sāstām ratukhšathrām ašaonim*; *yām ārmaitīm speñtām yaōsca tē ghenao ahura mazda* ‘we worship the righteous woman who ever [Skt. *prāyas*] thinks well, speaks well, does well, who is well-principled, who has the quality of a ‘*ratu*;’ (we worship) Speñta Armaiti and the women that are thine, O Mazda.’ The idea in this is that the righteous woman had the same merit and spiritual quality as a Ratu; for, as we see in this Gāh referred to, each of the preceding beings, men or youths, and objects, is especially invoked as *ašahē ratūm*. The same meaning applies in Vsp. iii. 4 and Yt. xxii. 18. The traditional rendering ‘obedient to her husband’—as Mills, S.B.E. xxxi. p. 342 note, seems already to have noticed—gives no satisfactory explanation of the compound; and moreover *ratu* is always the spiritual guide, whether in heaven or on earth, and not husband. It is proper here to add that to this latter statement Vd. xv. 9 is no exception, as *kaininem . . stātō-ratūm vā astātō-ratūm vā paradātām vā aparadātām vā* is ‘a maiden who has or has not been brought to the Ratu, whether already con-

firmed (?) or not confirmed (?), 'stātō-ratu' ('brought to the Ratu') evidently referring to an initiation into the religion something like a confirmation. In the Parsi faith this was and is the assuming of the Kosti. Spiegel, *Uebersetzung* ii. Introd. p. 22, expressly says 'von der Zeit an, wo das Kind den Kosti trägt, muss es sich auch einen Schutzpatron unter den Yazatas und einen geistlichen Rathgeber unter den Destürs aussuchen.' For our passage this is the whole story. On the custom, further, compare also Doshabhai Framji Karaka's *History of the Parsis*, Vol. i. pp. 122, 165, 166; and in support of *ratukhšathra* for the holy women of Mazdeism, see Yt. xiii. 139-142, 144.

To 2. *harethravaitiš*, *pāthravaitiš*: these two words receive an explanation in general from many other parts of the Avesta; see what is said also of the *Staota Yesnya* below, § 3, *yatha hiš fradathaṭ mazdaō . . . pāthrāi . . . harethrāi āśahē gaēthanām*. —*āšō-mizhdaō*: 'accompanied by the reward of Asha' or Righteousness here personified, i. e. the reward of Heaven; for Asha is the overseer of the realm of Truth and of the Law and so also of Paradise. He is the joint assessor of Ormazd himself, cf. Ys. xxix. 2; xlv. 9, 10, and often: his opponent is Druj, Ys. xlv. 11; xlix. 11; xlviii. 1; xlv. 13, 14; his creatures are *āśahē gaēthanām*, "the household of Faith," almost. —*parō-asnāi*: compounded of *parō* + *azan* 'beyond the day, beyond the present,' a general expression for the future. With this form compare Skt. *parōkṣa* 'beyond the eye, invisible;' and see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 1310a.

To 3. *tā*: as Geldner—see *K.Z.* xxviii. 404, *B.B.* xii. 95—has pointed out, *tā* must belong not to *gāthaō* but to *staota yesnya* that follows. Exactly what the *Staota Yesnya* were, it would be hard to say; they were not identical with the *Gāthās*, for they are mentioned by the side of *gāthaō* in Ys. lxxi. 6, 7, 18; liv. 2; lv. 5, 6. The term seems to be a broader designation under which the *Gāthās* were included with other hymns. This is shown by the frequent epithets *hañdāta*, *haurvām hañdāitīm*, which could apply only to a rather extended collection, and this should be kept in mind when *Shāyast lā-Shāyast* xiii. 1—*S.B.E.* v. p. 353—is commented upon. The theory, further, that *Staota Yesnya* = Ys. lvii—lxxii, gives no satisfactory answer to the question. Perhaps the key is to be looked for in the various selections enumerated in detail in Vsp. i. 3-9; this seems plausible. Among other passages see Ny. iv. 8; Vsp. ix. 7; xxiii. 1; Ys. lix. 33; Yt. xxiv. 28; x. 124; and *Fragm.* i. 1 *staotem vacō yēsñim*, Ys. xxi. 1 *yēsñim vacō*.

havanha: see Geldner, *Drei Yasht* p. 27, 109. —*aiwyāvanha*: the meaning of this word is hard to decide, for over the *ἀπ. λεγ.* we have no control. I have made it conjecturally a compound of *aiwi* + *avanh*, with intensive meaning, like *aiwi-aojanh*, *aiwi-thūra*, etc. With the form *aiwyāvanh* compare *aiwyāma* (*aiwi* + *ama*) 'having excessive might,' and *aiwyākhštar* (*aiwi* + *akhš*). —*frārāiti*, *vidāšē*: these two words are found only together. The latter word, as Professor Geldner personally tells me, must mean 'friendship, love,' and we may expect later from him an explanation of the word. The former,

frārāiti—as Geldner, *K.Z.* xxvii.238; xxvii.405, has shown—belongs, together with *rāiti* and *rāna*, to *vrā* (cf. also *ārmaiti*), and denotes ‘harmony, concord, unanimity, obedience, religious obedience;’ with it is to be connected also the adjective *frārāiṇha*, Yt. v.8, see below. The two meanings thus found will render with admirable force Vsp. xxi.3, *frārāiti vidīṣe yazamaide yaṭ asti aṇtare hvādaēnāiš ašaonīš* ‘the concord and love which exists among the righteous of our religion.’ —*suyamnandm*, *saošyañtām*: from *vsu* in sense of ‘promote, help, (in a religious sense) save;’ so here save from Hell when the final event comes. The Saoshyānts are those who at the latter judgment—perhaps the Frashakard—will save others from the eternal damnation. In Yt. xi.22 *ahmākem saošyañtām yaṭ bipaitištanām ašaonām*, the Saoshyānts are the priests, i. e. the later Dasturs, and each holds out that he will save his people from Hell. —*stōiš*, as weakest form from *vas* ‘be,’ denotes the ‘being, existence,’ and *vispayaō stōiš* is the entire existence. In Vsp. xviii.1, 2. *paoiryām ašaonō stīm* ‘the first existence of the righteous,’ i. e. on earth, is opposed to *vispāyūm uštātēm* ‘the everlasting blessedness,’ hereafter. Further, in Ys. xix.9 *vispām ašaonō stīm haitīmca bavaiñtīmca būšyēiñtīmca* ‘the whole existence that now is and is to be and shall be still;’ for *haitīm* can mean nothing but the actual present, *bavaiñtīm*, the coming, *būšyēiñtīm*, the life which shall then be afterwards, perhaps in the new order of things. See also Ys. xxxv.1. Yet see Yt. xiii.21. It may be added that in Yt. xi.22 *stōiš* is almost personified.

To 4. *aya ratufrita*:* these words are difficult, as they cannot go together, for *ratufrita* is certainly a locative as it stands (cf. for the form *vacastaštā*, Ys. lviii.8, Bartholomae, *Handbuch* § 223); while we can hardly allow that *aya* is a form of the locative, as would Spiegel, *Commentar* ad loc. and *Grammatik* § 182 fin. We must first take up *ratufriti*, which in all passages—Vsp. xi.5, 6, 20; Ys. xxv.3; iii.4; Vsp. ix.6, 7; iv.2; v.1; xii.5; Afr. iii.5; i.6—can mean little more than ‘the propitiation of a Ratu or religious spiritual chief, especially by a benediction, prayer;’ cf. also *āfriti*, *usefriti*, *fryō* (Ys. lxx.9), *āfrītar*, *āfrīna*, *āfrivana*. This is shown, moreover, by the connection in which the word always stands, and particularly by Afr. i.6, which gives the key-note to the signification, for there *ratufritiṣ* refers to the preceding ascription of praise to Ormazd; thus, *dātō hē myazdō ratufritiṣ* ‘the benediction (just mentioned) is the offering given to him,’ i. e. to the

* Since the above was in type, I have received notes from Dr. Jackson, in substance as follows: “It now seems better to take both *aya* and *ratufrita* as instrumentals, and together, in the sense ‘with this benediction.’ This interpretation is supported by most convincing parallels. At Yt. x.71, all good MSS. read *hathra nairyaya hāmvarēta* (sic) ‘with manly courage.’ With a like interpretation Ys. xlii.1 (cited below) becomes clear: *yazamaide vé . . . hañdātā* ‘we worship you, O Amesha Spentas, with the entire collection of the Yasna Haptañ-haiti.’ Likewise Vsp. xxii.1, *aya aibigara aya aibijareta*; and Vd. xxii.5, *dahma afrita* (so very good Persian MSS.).”—Corresp. Sec’y.

priest. This meaning suits in all passages : see especially Afr. iii. 5, where *ratufrita* is again the best reading, thus : *yō rapithwinahē ratufrita rapithwinem ratūm framarāiti rapithwinem ratūm frāyazāitē* 'whoso in the way of a ratufriti (loc.) of Rapithwina recites the Rapithwina Ratu (see note on § 6 below), and worships the R. R.'

Next *aya* : this is instr. fem. (compare for the form the advl. *ayā* found in the Rig-Veda); here it may be taken in the sense of 'with this chapter,' i. e. supply *baghaya*, as it should be particularly noted that in paragraph 7 below our section is entitled *bagha staotanām yēsnyandām*, so to be inferred from the close of Ys. xix, xx, xxi, and the Pahlavi superscription to Ys. xix. The whole idea of the passage is the hope that in benediction of a Ratu (*ratufrita*) one may make his absolution (*hvāvayañhem*) by means of this prayer (*aya*); and the composer prays that it may count as a meritorious action in the world above. He wishes thus also to enhance the value of his work by giving it a certain sanctity. As to the form *ratufrita*, once more, it is worthy of note that the inferior MSS, both in our passage and in Afr. iii.5, furnish the variant *ratufriti*, and *aya ratufriti* would be easy; but the best manuscripts and the lectio difficilior have been adhered to. It is interesting to add, however, that in Ys. xix.15 *aya añtareukhti* 'with this interdict' we have the variants in *-ta*; can our *aya ratufrita* be parallel?

hvāvayañhem : adjective from *avayāh-* 'absolution,' cf. Ys. lxviii.1 *avayām*, and Geldner, *K.Z.* xxviii.407. Thus the Avestan *hva-avayañh-em* : *avayām* (from *avayāh-*) : : Skt. *su-medhas-am* : Av. *mazdām* (from *mazdāh-*). In quite the same way is the adjective above mentioned, *frārañha* Yt. v.8, from substantive **frārāh-*, as *hvāvayañha* from *avayāh-*. —*jaseñtem* : compare with *hvāvayañhem jaseñtem* the use of *jas* also in Vd. iv.44 *yēzi nāiri-cinañhō jasn* 'if they come seeking a wife,' and Vd. xiii.22; i.15. —*paiti-barāhi* . . . *hvarštāiš* : 'mayest thou (O Asha, cf. § 5 and Westergaard's ed. p.319b) score the reciter of this chapter up with good thoughts, etc.' The idea of the account kept by Asha is to be found again in Afr. i.7*, Westergaard's edition, p. 319, foot note, *hātām cinmānē yať aśahē vahištahē* 'Asha Vahishta's record of mankind;' and this thought of thus 'laying up treasures in Heaven' occurs elsewhere in the Avesta, cf. Yt. x.32 *hām hīs cinmānē barañuha* | *nī hīs dasva garō nmānē* 'put these sacrifices (O Mithra) to our account, lay them up in Garo Nmana. So also, and with *paiti-bar* moreover, in Yt. xix.33 *para ahmāť yať hem aēm* | *draogem vācem añhaithīm* | *cinmānē paiti-barata* 'until he put to his account lying untrue speech.' Observe the middle voice in *paiti-barata*. According to the Avesta, therefore, a record was kept much as in the 'book of life,' Revelation xxii.19.

To 6. *dātā añhēuš paouryēhyā* : one of the testimonies to the value and estimation attributed to the Staota Yesnya; they contain all the rules (*dātā*) necessary for the life in this world, cf. further *frašem vasna ahūm dathāna*, below. —*maremna*, *verezimna*, etc. : refer to different kinds of recitation—cf. Ys. xix.6, 7, 21—and to determine precisely is somewhat difficult. But *maremna* is in all passages the memorizing, committing to memory, and recalling; while *verezimna* refers to the act

of applying the knowledge on all proper occasions: thus, Vd.xviii.5 *amarō everezyō* 'without recalling, without putting to use the sacred learning;' cf. Vsp. xii.3 and often. —*paitišāna*: 'practised,' as in Ys. lvii.13 *paitišata mazdayasna* | *sraośahē ašyēhē yasnem* 'practise diligently, ye Mazdayasnians, the worship of Sraosha.' —*paitišmaremna*: the 'thinking to one's self,' as opposed to *framaremna*, 'aloud, i. e. reciting.' This is shown by Yt. v.11, where *narem paitišmaremna* 'thinking of a man' is elaborated by the parallel *manaiṇha mainimna* 'musing in thought.' —*framaremna*, as we should expect from *mar* above, is in all places the expression of what is in the mind, 'reciting,' perhaps 'lispings' or something similar. See again Ys. xix.6. So also *framaretar*, *framaretha* § 7 below, and *framereti*, especially Vsp. xv.2. This rendering is appropriate also in Afr. iii.5 *yō rapithwinem ratūm fram-arāiti rapithwinem ratūm frāyazāitē* 'whoso recites the Rapithwina Ratu,' i. e. the Rapithwina chapter—the prayer being named from the presiding Ratu; for *rapithwina ratu* is nothing more than the title of the selection and corresponds to the Pazand designation Afrīngān Rapithwin. The chapters must have had their titles in Avesta as much as in Pazand; we know this also from *dahma āfritiš*, *fraoreitīš hāitīš*, and numerous others. The meanings thus given apply equally in Ys. lxxi.1 *kaṭ asti rathwām frameretiš* 'what is (i. e. is equivalent to) the recitation of the Ratu prayers,' cf. Ys. xix.5; Fragm. vii.1; also Vsp. ii.5 *rathwām framaretārem* 'the reciter of the Ratu prayers,' again Vsp. v.1.

frāyazemna: what the exact force of this word is can hardly be said, as it is technical in its character. It is found not merely alone but often also by the side of the uncompounded form of *yaz* cf. Yt. v.90, etc.; it seems therefore to have denoted some additional kind of worship by way of conclusion, accompanied perhaps by ceremonies of which we know little or nothing; for Yt. viii.15; x.91; v.90, 91; xiii.50 do not answer the question. It is probably, however, thus best taken literally, as also *frāyāštīm* in § 7, and *hufrāyāšta* in Vsp. xiv.1, etc.; it was common, after finishing a prayer, to worship it. Compare for example Ys. liv.2, and all the closing formulas to the chapters. Yet on the other hand comes the possibility that *frāyazemna* may mean 'brought as an offering,' for the simple verb, it seems, is found so used with two accusatives, one of the person and the other of the hymn offered; see Ys. xlii.1 *yazamaidē vē amešā spentā yasnahe haptanḥātōiš haṇdātā* 'we bring to you as an offering the collection of the Yasna Haptanḥaiti.' Or could *haṇdātā* be there a derivative from *haṇdāiti* and be compared with the suggestions as to *ratufrita* and *aṇtareukhta* above? Elsewhere we have the instrumental; cf. often *kana thwām yasna yazānē*. If, however, as is generally accepted, *haṇdātā* should be acc. pl., we may then compare Vd. xviii.43 *yēhē hātām frāyazāitē* 'offers the Y.H. prayer as a sacrifice;' cf. further Afr. iii.5 *rapithwinem ratūm frāyazāitē*, already cited above. But see below § 7 note.

To 7. *baghām staotanām yēsnyanām*: this apparently can only mean the section of the Staota Yesnya, perhaps §§ 3 ff. That the piece is so entitled is to be inferred not only from this, but also from the use of

bagha at the ends of each of the chapters Ys. xix; xx; xxi. Cf. also Ys. xix.3, 5. —*frasraōthrem*, *framarethrem*, *fragāthrem*, *frāyāštīm*: cf. the explanation above, and for the method of recitation refer also to Ys. xix.6 *marāt*—*frā-dreñjayāt*—*frā-srāvayāt*—*frā-yazāitē*, ‘has in mind, murmurs, intones, worships.’ See particularly, moreover, on the four-fold recital, Ys. ix.14, ‘thou didst intone the Ahuna Vairya four times, marking the divisions, and each succeeding time with louder intonation.’ Perhaps we might infer from this that *frā-yaz*, which closes every series of this kind, refers not to the appended *yazamaidē* formulas, but to the last and loudest and most ceremonial recital of worship; possibly *tem yazāi suruvata yasna* is to be compared. But we should for the present prefer to leave the whole question as to *frā-yazemna* an open one.

MAN

A. The earthly part which was given up at death (<i>gaetha</i> , the entire earthly existence being)		B. The immortal imperishable part	
<p>α. The corporeal material portion</p> <p>α. The immaterial part, <i>ushtana</i>, life, which was lost at death (Vd. v. 9)</p>		<p>β. The corporeal material <i>kerefsh</i> (cf. Yt. xlii 61) which continues material after the resurrection</p> <p>β. The immaterial</p>	
<p><i>tanu</i>, the entire body</p> <p><i>ast</i>, the bones, frame</p>		<p><i>tevishi</i>, the physical forces</p> <p><i>badhti</i>, the consciousness</p> <p><i>urvan</i>, soul, spirit</p>	
<p>The heavenly image or reflex, <i>fravashi</i>; his angel in heaven, his faith (cf. <i>fravarane</i>) personified</p>			

2. On the *jāyānya*-charm, AV.vii.76.3–5, and the *apacit*-hymns (vi.83; vii.74.1–2; vii.76.1–2) of the Atharva-Veda; by Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.¹

The charm directed against the *jāyānya*, AV.vii.76.3 fg. is, in difficulty of explanation, not surpassed by any hymn of the AV. The Pet. Lex., and Böhtlingk in the abridged lexicon of the Petersburg Academy, gloss the word simply by ‘eine bestimmte krankheit.’ Adalbert Kuhn in Kuhn’s *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* xiii.

¹ The author of this and the next article has published previously contributions to the exegesis of the Atharva-Veda, as follows: In the Proceedings of the American Oriental Society for May, 1885 (Journal, vol. xiii., p. xlii. fg.), for May, 1886 (ibid. p. cxii. fg.), and for October, 1886 (ibid. p. cxxxii. fg.); furthermore in the American Journal of Philology, vol. vii., No. 4, pp. 466–488.

155, and Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 377, regard it as identical with a disease called *jāyēnya* in TS.ii.3.5.1-3; 5.6.4-5; the *jāyēnya* is there mentioned in connection with diseases called *yakṣma* (*rājayakṣma*, *pāpayakṣma*, etc.), which are currently believed to be designations of consumption. Ludwig, *Der Rig-Veda* iii. pp. 342, 500, explains it as being directed against poisonous insects. In translating the hymn, I shall for the present leave *jāyānya* untranslated, as also the second half of stanza 4, which contains the word *akṣita*, which has hitherto been misunderstood by the translators.

3. 'The *jāyānya*, which crushes the ribs, which penetrates the *talīḍya* (according to the lexicons, 'some part of the body'), also whatever one is fixed upon the head, every one is driven out.'²

5. 'We know, O *jāyānya*, thy origin, whence thou didst spring; how canst thou strike here, in whose house we offer oblations?'

The fourth verse begins: 'The *jāyānya*, furnished with wings, flies, he settles down upon man;' the second half of the stanza reads: *tād akṣitasya bheṣajām ubhāyoh sūkṣatasya ca*. The Petersburg lexicons, and Whitney in the Index, read *akṣitasya* without emending; the former translate the word by 'unverletzt,' which yields no clear meaning, when applied to the passage: 'this is the remedy for him who is not injured (?) and also for him who is injured.' Both Zimmer and Ludwig recognize the antithetical character of *ā-kṣitasya* and *sū-kṣatasya*, and they emend each in a different direction: Ludwig reads *sūkṣitasya* to correspond to *akṣitasya*, Zimmer *akṣatasya* to correspond to *sūkṣatasya*. Ludwig then translates: 'das ist das mittel gegen den nicht festsitzenden, und auch gegen den festsitzenden.' Zimmer finds support for his reading *akṣatasya*, and at the same time for his theory that the charm is directed against a kind of consumption, in the word *kṣata*, which is reported by Wise in his 'Commentary on the Hindu system of medicine', p. 321, to have the special value of 'rupture, or ulcer of the respiratory organs.' Zimmer translates accordingly: 'hier habe ich ein heilmittel für den menschen, der den *kṣata* noch nicht hat und den, der schwer an ihm erkrankt ist.'

The ritual offers us a suggestion which points in a very different direction. In the *Kāuṣika-sūtra* 31. 11, and in Dārila's comment to *Kāuṣ.* 32. 11, 13, we find mention of a disease called *akṣata*. The phrase *akṣatabhāiṣajyam*, which Dārila employs, can have but one value, that of 'remedy for *akṣata*.' Moreover, the passage 32.11 fg., which is entitled by Dārila *akṣatabhāiṣajyam*, describes the ritual connected with the charm under discussion. We are left, however, to find the real character of the disease by implication from the practices reported in the ritual. The clearest passage is *Kāuṣ.* 31.11 fg.:

11. *idam id vā ity akṣatam mūtrapphenenā 'bhyudya*.

Dārila: *mānuṣamūtrapphenena aruṇḍum* (?) *kledayati* 'with the hymn AV.vi.57 he moistens the *akṣata* with the urine of a human being.'

² So if *nirāstam* of the vulgate text is emended with Whitney, Index Verborum to the AV., to *nirāstam*. Ludwig, *ibid.*, p. 500, emends to *nirāstham*, translating 'I have driven out.'

12. *prakṣipati*. Dārila : *tato mūtram prakṣipati pāṇinā* 'he throws the urine with his hand (upon the *akṣata*).'

13. *dantarajasā 'vadegdhi*. Dārila : *dantamalinā "līmpaty akṣatam* 'he smears the *akṣata* with the scourings from teeth.'

Much less simple and clear is the ritual connected with the *jāyānya*-charm, Kāuṣ. 32.11 fg.:

11. *yaḥ kīkasā iti piṣṭilavīṇātāntrīm badhnāti*. Dārila : *piṣṭilavīṇā tasyās tāntrīm badhnāti, akṣatabhāiṣajyam*.

12. *tantryā kṣitikām*. Dārila : *tasyā* (Cod. *tarasyā*) *vīṇāyāḥ kṣitī-kāmtayāi 'va tantryā badhnāti kṣitikārabhasyopari tṛṇaḍamkha-* (! for *-khaṇḍa-*?) *rohyādanārthaḥ* (?).

13. *vīṇāvadhrīm svayammlānaṁ triḥ samasya*. Dārila : *badhnāti, akṣatabhāiṣajyam*.

The practice described in Kāuṣ. 31.11 fg. is clear in one regard : it refers to some external trouble ; and we are certainly not too bold if we allow the obvious etymology of *akṣata* 'not cut, not wounded,' to guide us. The assumption that *akṣata* means 'a tumor, boil,' or the like, not caused by a weapon, seems almost unavoidable as far as the ritual is concerned.

The same result, in a less severely technical form, must be applied to the passage of the AV. under discussion. It is to be translated as follows, after emending *ākṣitasya* to *ākṣatasya* :

'Here is a remedy both for (boils or sores) not caused by cutting, as well as for wounds sharply cut.' And there seems to be no ground to doubt the intelligence of the Sūtra, when it states that the hymn was directed against such a disease as tumors. We are thus led to identify *jāyānya* with *ākṣata* : or at least we are justified in believing that the *jāyānya* refers to some external skin disease.

Ludwig's interpretation of the *jāyānya*-charm, as being directed against an obnoxious insect of that name, evidently rests upon two grounds. First, the statement in the fourth verse : *pakṣī jāyānyaḥ patati sā ā viṣati pūruṣam*, which he translates 'der vogel Jāyānya fliegt, und komt in den menschen hinein.'

The sentence has been translated above more literally, 'the *jāyānya*, furnished with wings, flies, he settles down upon man ;' and it is evident that a disease which manifests itself externally may easily have been conceived as having flown on to the body. It will appear below that similar expressions have given rise to what I cannot but regard as an erroneous explanation of the *apacit*-hymns.

An absolutely certain case in which disease, not insects, is conceived as flying forth when it leaves the body, is contained in RV.x.97.13 : *sākāṁ yakṣma prā pata cāṣeṇa kikiḍivīṇā sākāṁ vātasya dhrāḍjyā* 'O *yakṣma*, fly forth, fly with the blue jay, fly with the current of the wind'; cf. KZ. xiii. 70.

Secondly, the first part of the hymn is actually devoted to a charm against the *apacit*, which Ludwig, together with all other interpreters, also believes to refer to noxious insects. This brings us to the second part of our enquiry.

The AV. contains three charms against *apacit*: vi.83; vii.74.1,2; and vii.76.1,2, the first part of the hymn just discussed. Aside from these passages the word *apacit* is referred to incidentally in vi.25; it does not occur in any other Samhitā in this form. The two Petersburg lexicons, Kuhn in KZ.xiii.155, Ludwig in Rig-Veda iii. 342, 500, Zimmer in Altindisches Leben 54, 97, and Florenz in Bezzenberger's Beiträge xii. 280, regard the *apacit* as a certain noxious insect. The internal evidence of the hymns, which seems at first sight to make for such an interpretation, is as follows. In vi.83. the *apacit* are called upon to fly away: vi. 83.1, *āpacitaḥ prā patata suparṇo vasatér iva*, 'fly away, O ye *apacit*, as a bird from its nest;' vi.83.2, *asātikā rāmāyaṇy āpacit prā patiṣyati glāur itāḥ prā patiṣyati*, 'the *apacit*, the daughter of the black one, without bearing offspring, shall fly away; the *glāu* (Pet. Lexicons and Zimmer, 'the boil'; Ludwig, 'the owl') shall fly away.' It is to be noted that these passages regard *apacit* from a point of view, converse to that from which *jāyānya* is viewed in vii.76.4: 'the *jāyānya*, winged, flies, he settles down upon man.' The *jāyānya* is depicted in the act of coming on before the exorcism has been performed; the *apacit*, as going away after the potent influences have been set to work. Ludwig consistently regards one and the other as referring to insects; Zimmer sees insects in the *apacit*, consumption in the *jāyānya*.

Aside from these passages, there is but one phrase, not at all free from obscurity, in vi.25, which can be employed to support this view of the *apacit*:

1. *Pāṇca ca yāḥ pañcāśāc ca saṁyānti mānyā abhi, itās tāḥ sārva naçyantu vākā āpacitām iva.*
2. *Sāpta ca yāḥ saptaśiç ca saṁyānti grāivya abhi, itās tāḥ, etc.*
3. *Nāva ca yāḥ navatiç ca saṁyānti skāndhya abhi, itās tāḥ, etc.*

'The five and fifty which assemble upon the back of the head, let them pass away from here *vākā āpacitām iva*.'

Kuhn, in KZ.xiii.130, translates: 'wie die schwärme der *apacits*.' The Petersburg lexicons, and Florenz ibid. translate: 'as the buzzing of the *apacits*,' a translation supported only by the supposed etymology of the word (root *vac*), aside from the preconceived notion that the *apacit* are insects. The stem *vākā* occurs nowhere else in the meaning 'buzzing'; it means 'formula, recitation,' and the like.

Against this feeble testimony, the remaining context of the hymns themselves protests most emphatically. I claim for *apacit* the meaning of 'sore, pustule, boil,' or the like. AV.vii.76.1,2 is to be translated somewhat as follows:

1. 'The *apacit*, which are more evil than the evil ones (i. e. the most virulent), those which are drier than the *sehu* (an obscure designation for a part of the human body, mentioned in the Kāthakasaṁhitā 84. 12 along with the spleen, *sehuç ca plihā ca*: Ludwig translates it by 'harz'), those which are moister than salt, these fall off more easily than the easily falling one (i. e. fall off most easily; read perhaps, in accordance with the demands of the metre, *ā susrāsaḥ susrastarāḥ* ?).

2. 'The *apacit* which are upon the neck, and those which are upon the breast, and those which are upon the *vijāman* (Ludwig, 'knöchel';

Pet. Lex., 'members of the body which are in pairs',) fall off by themselves.'

The implication in both verses is, that the *apacit* will fall off easily owing to the potency of the charm. Surely there can be no insects implied; difficult as it may be to imagine that there are insects which are drier than the *sehu* and moister than salt, the applicability of such adjectives to sores or boils is very palpable. The subdivision of flying insects into such as belong to the neck, to the breast, etc., is also extremely doubtful, but most natural in the case of different phases of some skin-disease.

AV.vii.74.1,2 may be translated as follows :

1. 'We have heard it said that the mother of the black *apacit* is red ; with the root found by the divine sage do I strike all these.

2. 'I strike the foremost one of them, and I strike also the middlemost one of them ; this hindmost one I cut off like (i. e. as easily as) a bunch of hair.'

And AV.vi.83 :

1. 'Fly away, O ye *apacit*, as a bird from the nest ; may the sun effect a remedy ; may the moon shine you away.

2. 'One is variegated, one is white, one is black, and two are red ; I have caught the names of all of them. Go away, ye slayers of men.

3. 'The *apacit*, the daughter of the black one, without bearing offspring, will fly away ; the boil will fly away, the *galunta* (swelling?)¹ will perish.'

Here the manifestation of a certain kind of insect in so many different colors is improbable ; at the best it would be necessary to see in the name *apacit* a very generic term for insects. On the other hand, the emphatic mention of different colors—black, red, white, variegated—is a likely product of even superficial observation in the case of skin-diseases, and is paralleled by i.23, a charm directed against *kilāsa*, leprosy or the like :

1. 'By night thou didst grow, o plant, thou sable one, dark one, black one ; do thou, who art full of color, stain the leprous, gray spot?

2. 'Drive away from here what is leprous and gray, and also what is variegated ; may your own color settle down upon you, and cause the white spots to fly away.'

In the ritual to i.23 and 24 (Kāuṣ. 26.22 fg.), after dung has been rubbed upon the discolored spot until it becomes red, the sores are cut off : 22. *naktamjātā suparṇo jāta iti mantroktam* (Dārila : *çvitram*, Cod. *svitram*) *çakrd ā lohitaṁ* (Dār. *yāval lohitaṁ çvitrasthānam* [Cod. *svitra-*] *āgataṁ*) *praghr̥ṣyā "limpati*. 23. *palitāny āchidyā*. With this last phrase we may compare directly the pāda *ā chinadmī stūkām iva* in the *apacit*-hymn (vii.74.2^d).

We are not favored by the ritualistic writings of the AV. with a distinct explanation of the term *apacit*. But an unbiased application of

¹ Wise, p. 311, has, "*Gilin*. The swelling in this disease is like the swelling of a plum, not painful, but hard ; and is produced by diseased phlegm, and blood." Or is this rather *gilāyu* 'a hard boil in the throat'? see Pet. Lex. sub voce.

the statement of the sūtra will not fail to corroborate the interpretation which is here advanced. Kāuṣ. 31.16 fg. rubricates two of the *apacit*-hymns : 16. *apacitā ā susrasa iti kinstyādini* 'with the two hymns vi.83 and vii.76 he applies the performances which begin with the use of the shell.' Kāuṣ. 30.16 tells what these performances are : *kinstyā-ṣvajām-bīlo-dakaraksikā-maṣakādibhyāṁ (!) dañṣayati*. 'He rubs (the place) with (moisture from a) shell (Dārila : *kinstyāḥ ṣaṅkhaḥ*, . . . *kinsty-enā "lepanam*), smears it with the saliva of a dog, then subjects it to the bite of leeches, gnats, etc. (? Dārila : *udakaraksikā jalūkādigrhakolikā*). Kāuṣ. 31.17 continues : *lohitalavaṇam saṁkṣudyā 'bhiniṣṭhivati*. Dārila : *sāindhavalavaṇam cūrṇīkrtyā 'paciti kṛtvā tam abhimukhe niṣṭhivet*. 'Having ground up rock-salt, having placed it upon the *apacit*, he spits against that (salt).'

The entire treatment seems to be in accordance with modern ideas of therapeutics. The boil is softened by mucous applications, then leeches are applied, after which a sort of poultice of ground rock-salt, rendered soft and pulpy by saliva, is placed upon the opening, for astringent purposes.

The ritual which the Sūtras present for vii.74 is less pointed, but certainly contains nothing which militates against our view. The passage is Kāuṣ. 32.8 fg : 8. *apacitām iti vāiṇavena dārbyūṣeṇa* (var.-*ūṣeṇa*) *kṣṇorṇājyena kālābundāi stukāgrāir iti mantroktam*. Dārila : *dhanuṣadorbhyuṣaṇa (! for dhanuṣā dārbyūṣeṇa ?) darbhavikārā darbhiraṣṭhūḥ . . . kṣṇorṇā jyā yasya tasya tat . . . tena dhanuṣā kālābundāir bundā iṣavaḥ tāiḥ kṣṇavarṇāiḥ stukāgrāiḥ, ūrṇāstukāgrāi stukā jaṭo 'cyate tāir mantroktam vidhyati, apacitam ity arthaḥ*.

9. *caturthyā 'bhiniḍhāyā 'bhividhyati*.

10. *jyāstukājvālena*. Dārila : *jyāyā stukayā 'vajvālah . . . tena avasiṅcati apacitam*.

Here the practice is rather symbolical than therapeutical. With black arrows, which have flakes of wool tied to their points (cf. vii.74. 2^d : *chinadmi stukām iva*) and which are shot from a bow made of reed, furnished with a *dārbyūṣa* (? *darbhiraṣṭhūḥ*) and with a bow-string made of black wool, he strikes the *apacit* (cf. vii.74.2 : *vidhyāmy āsām prathamām* etc.). With the fourth (verse of the hymn ?), having laid on (an arrow ?), he hits against the *apacit*. Finally he washes it off with a lotion produced by heating the bow-string and dipping it into water, which is thus made warm ; cf. Kāuṣ. 27.29 and 33.

In support of this explanation I am fortunately able to bring the authority of the medical Cāstras, which seems to have escaped the eyes of the earlier interpreters of *apacit*. Wise in his digest of Hindu medicine—a work whose value would be increased manifold, if it were provided with an index of its countless names of diseases, plants, and remedies—has a most significant passage bearing upon this point on p. 315 :

“Scrofulous swellings (Gandamālā).

“When many small tumors like plums appear in the axilla, neck, back, and groins (!), they are produced by diseased fat and phlegm. They

suppurate slowly, and continue to appear and suppurate for a long period, when it is called *Apachī* (!)."

Some of the features of the treatment are worthy of notice :

"Different *fomentations* . . . and *poultices* are applied, and when they (i. e. the tumors) suppurate, open, and discharge the matter, wash the wound with a decoction of *bilwa*, etc. . . . A poultice made of *tila*, and the leaves of the castor-oil tree *mixed with salt*, and applied to the part (!) . . . When the disease is produced by bile, *apply leeches*."

After this exposition of the nature of the disease, we need hardly beg indulgence for the following etymology. Kuhn, KZ. xiii.155, explains the word as 'die abmagernden (sc. insecten).' The first value of root *ci* with *apa* in the Pet. Lex. is 'ablesen,' 'pick off.' The disease seems to be viewed as 'an act of scaling or paring off' the foreign excrescences on the body. We may compare semasiologically Lat. *scabies*, *scabere*, Germ. *die schabe*, *schaben*, Engl. *scab*.

At VS. xii.97 we find mention of the disease *upacit* in juxtaposition with *balāsa*, *aṛṣas*, etc. I make no doubt that this is the same disease with its name altered by a popular etymology, which is probably felt correctly by Mahīdhara, when he glosses thus : *upacinvanti śarīraṁ vṛdhāyanti* 'ty *upacitaḥ* ' (they are called) *upacit*, because they cover over the body and cause it to swell.'

Returning now to the hymn AV. vi.25, in which the *apacit* are mentioned incidentally, we find that the translators have failed to define its purpose sufficiently. Kuhn, KZ. xiii.128, treats the hymn under the head of 'Sieben und siebzigerlei krankheit'; he compares it with Germanic formulas directed against fever and other diseases, which are often described as being of seventy-seven varieties. Florenz, in Bezz. Beitrage xii.281, does not feel quite certain that the charm is directed against disease at all, but thinks it possible that some febrile disease, accompanied by eruptions, is in question. There is however no indication, either in the hymn or in its ritual, of the presence of fever in connection with the disease. The hymn simply states that the fifty-five which are upon the back of the head, and the seventy-seven which are upon the neck, and the ninety-nine which are upon the shoulders, shall pass away. The ritual is clearly directed against a disease similar to the *apacit*, a kind of boil or tumor. Kāuṣ. 30.14 fg. is as follows :

14. *pañca ca yā iti pañca pañcāśatam paraśuparṇān kāṣṭhāir ādīpayati*. 'With AV. vi.25 he kindles by means of pieces of wood fifty-five *pañca*-leaves, which have the form of an axe.'

15. *kapāle praçṛtaṁ* (Dār. *parṇarasam*) *kāṣṭhenā* "limpati. 'The sap of the leaves which has boiled forth from the leaves he smears upon the tumor.'

16. Continues with the same process which figures prominently in the treatment of the *apacit*, the smearing with the fluid from a shell etc. as described above.

Neither the sūtras nor Dārila however report anything directly about the symptoms or the name of the disease. I believe however that a part of the deficiency can be supplied from the Āśtras. Wise, ibid. p. 316, reads as follows :

"Tumors of the neck (*Manskunder*).

"Is a variety of the Gandamālā or scrofulous swellings. They are hard and large, and when they suppurate they should be opened. After which the cavity is to be cleaned with astringent washes."

The suggestion that '*manskunder*' veils the words *mānyā* and *skāndhyā* contained in this hymn will scarcely fail to gain assent. It would seem perhaps too that we must supply with the words *mānyā*, *grāivryā*, *skāndhyā* some word having the meaning of 'tumor' or the like, not 'sinews' or 'muscles,' as the previous translations have done. To such a construction points also the statement of the Anukramaṇī, *pañca ca yā iti mantroktamanyāvināṣanadevatyam*.

The word *vākā* in the refrain, *vākā apacitām iva*, is translated by Kuhn as 'swarms (of *apacit*)'; by the Pet. Lexicons and Florenz, as 'buzzing.' With the change of attitude towards the hymn which is here recommended, neither of these translations is acceptable. As it seems impossible to retain the word, we may perhaps resort to an emendation based upon the well-known confusion in the MSS. of *v* and *p*: we read *pākā apacitām iva* 'may they (the tumors) pass away like the pustules of the *apacit*.' The implication would then be that the tumors in question are 'hard and large' (Wise *ibid.*), and that the *apacit* are more easily brought to the point of breaking open.

3. On the so-called fire-ordeal hymn, Atharva-Veda ii.12; by Prof. Bloomfield.

This hymn has been invested in the past with quite unusual interest, because it has been translated no less than five times, aside from many chance references to it, and because it has been considered very generally as an incantation accompanying a fire ordeal, pronounced by the person undergoing the ordeal against his accusers. It was, moreover, thus rendered prominent as containing the earliest intimation of the existence of ordeals in general, and furthermore the only distinct allusion to ordeals in the Vedic Saṁhitās.

So far as the existence in the Vedic period of the fire-ordeal in a germinal form at least is concerned, we have the distinct report of the Pañcaviṅṣa-brāhmaṇa (xiv.6.6). Two brahmins of the race of Kaṇva, Vatsa and Medhātithi by name, are disputing, and in the course of the dispute Medhātithi accuses Vatsa of not being a brahman, his mother having been a çūdra-woman. Vatsa proposes an ordeal of fire to decide which one of them be the one more versed in brahmanical knowledge. Vatsa entered the fire singing the *Vātsa sāman*, i.e. a sāman-song of his own composition, and not a hair on his head was burned (*tasya na loma canāu*"ṣat). This, and a passage in the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad (6.16) in which the guilt or innocence of a thief is determined by letting him carry in his hands a red-hot axe, are genuine Vedic (in the wider sense) instances of the existence of ordeals in general, and fire-ordeals in particular. The later law books furthermore are quite explicit in their treatment of various other ordeals—they recognize nine altogether—such as licking a red-hot plough-share, getting a metal coin from a kettle of hot melted butter, immersion into water, administering of poison, etc.

Standing upon such ground, the supposition that a Vedic hymn might be found which accompanied this religious and judicial act was very natural. It was accordingly made for this hymn, first by Emil Schlagintweit in an address before the Royal Bavarian Academy on the occasion of the 170th anniversary of its foundation, in March, 1866, entitled 'Die Gottesurtheile der Indier.' In 1873 Albrecht Weber translated the hymn a second time in his *Indische Studien*, xiii.p.164 fg., supporting in all essentials Schlagintweit's view. Later Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben* p.184, and Ludwig, *Rig-Veda* iii.p.445, also gave in their adhesion to this interpretation. Still more recently Kaegi in his excellent treatise entitled *Alter und Herkunft des germanischen Gottesurtheils* (Festschrift zur Begrüssung der xxxix. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Zürich; September, 1887) p. 51, has characterized the eighth verse of the same hymn as an utterance spoken over one about to pass through a fire-ordeal. Against this authority there has been but one dissenting voice. J. Grill, a disciple of Roth, has translated the hymn in his 'Hundert Lieder des Atharva-Veda' p.16, and cautiously places it, along with a number of other hymns, under the heading 'Feinde;' i.e. he supposes it to be directed against enemies. In his notes he expresses himself as not altogether convinced that the view of his predecessors is incorrect, but he cites an oral statement of Prof. Roth to the effect that he finds himself unable to detect anything pertaining to a fire-ordeal in the hymn.

I believe that the character of this hymn can be settled definitely by considering its treatment in the *Kāuṣika*, which a literal unprejudiced translation of the hymn itself will exhibit as perfectly intelligent; in all probability the ritual application and the diaskeuasis, which united the somewhat variegated materials of which the hymn consists, sprung up at the same time and as the result of the same ideas and needs. It is a fierce imprecation against an enemy who is thwarting some pious work with unholy practices. Accordingly it is treated in the sixth book of that treatise, which professes in its opening sūtra that it is devoted to *abhicāra*, witchcraft and incantation. In such practices our hymn must have held a very prominent position, as it has a special and very significant name, which is the privilege of only a few favored and commonly employed hymns. It is called (*Kāu.*47,12) *bharadvāja-pravraska* 'the hewer or cleaver of Bharadvāja' (who is the author; cf. ii.12,3). The passage in question is a *paribhāṣā-sūtra* introductory to the sixth book, and reads as follows: *bharadvājapavraskenā 'ṅgirasam daṇḍam vṛcātī*. Dārila glosses: *dyāvāprthivī urv antarīkṣam iti sūktam bharadvāja(pra)vraskam bharadvājasampratyayārtham*. A literal translation of the sūtra is: 'With the cleaver of Bharadvāja (i.e. with the hymn AV.ii.12) he cuts a staff for practices pertaining to witchcraft.' The real value of the passage is as follows: 'When in the course of rites described in the following book (the sixth, devoted to *abhicāra*) a staff for witchcraft¹ is needed, then this staff is to be cut

¹ My authority for translating *āṅgīrasa* rather freely by 'pertaining to witchcraft' is *Kāu.*47.2 (also a *paribhāṣā-sūtra* of the sixth book): *daśīṇataḥ sambhā-*

with the hymn called the 'cleaver of Bharadvāja,' i. e. ii.12. Cf. especially verse 2nd : *vṛcāmi tām kūliṣene 'va vṛkṣān yó asmākam māna idān hindāsti* 'I cut him who interferes with this our plan, as one cuts a tree with an axe.' A staff so procured is then employed variously in Kāuṣ. 47.14,16,18; 48.22. In 47.16 the function of this staff is sketched clearly as follows : *vajro 'si sapatnahā tvayā 'dya vṛtram sākṣīya . . . iti daṇḍam ādatte*, the person about to practice with such a staff takes it up with the verse : 'Thou art a thunderbolt, a slayer of rivals, with thee may I to-day overcome an enemy, etc.' In 47.18 the staff is employed actively in connection with the dire imprecation AV. vi.134 : *ayam vajra iti bāhyato daṇḍam ūrdhvam avāgagran tīrṇbhir anvrcaṁ nihanti*, reciting the hymn AV. vi.134 (' May this thunderbolt satiate itself in *ṛtam* ; may it overthrow the empire and destroy the life of this one. May it break necks and crush skulls, as the Lord of might (Indra) crushed [the neck and skull] of Vṛtra, etc.) he stands outside holding the staff high in the air, the point downward, and strikes it into (the ground) three times, once after each verse of the hymn.'

Equally clear is the direct ritual application of the hymn. It is rubricated in Kāuṣ. 47.25 fg.

25. *dṛāvāprthivī urv iti paraṣupalāṣena dakṣiṇā dhāvataḥ padam vṛcātī*.

Dār. *paraṣuḥ kuṭhāraḥ palāṣam kuṭhāramukhaṁ dakṣiṇāyām diṣi dhāvataḥ dveṣyasya padam padasthānam chinattī*.

'One cuts the foot (i. e. breaks the foot-support) of his enemy, as he runs in a southerly direction, with the blade of an axe, while reciting the hymn ii.12.'

26. *anvak tris tiryak triḥ*.

Dār. *chedanavidhim āha : anupadarekhābhīḥ* (Cod. *anvupa-*) . . . *triḥ prthutvena trībhiḥ (!)*.

'He cuts three (lines) along (the course of the running enemy) and three (lines) across (the same).'

27. *akṣnayā* (thus emended : two MSS. *akṣṇayām* ; five others *ayakṣṇayām*) *saṁsthāpya*.

Dār. *akṣṇaḥ koṇaḥ koṇe na samāpanam koṇa dvitvā (! for koṇe chittvā?) dvayo rekhayoḥ kriyā pratirekhaṁ* (Cod. *-reṣam*) *sūktāvṛttih, saṁsthāpye 'ti vacanam prativraṣcanagrahaṇam mā bhūt*.

Further on, sūtra 28 and 29 describe a method of testing the efficacy of this hostile practice :

28. *āvraśkānyāñṇūn² palāṣam* (var. *palāṣa*) *upanaḥya bhraṣṭre* (var. *bhraṣṭe*) ' *bhyasyati* (var. *nyasyati*).

ram āharaty āṅgirasam, 'utensils for the practice of witchcraft are brought on from a southerly direction.' Dārila's gloss is : *ghoraḍravayāṅām āharaṇam vidhānāt*. Cf. also the three names of one of the five so-called *kalpas* of the Atharva-Veda : *āṅgirasa-kalpa*, *abhicāra-kalpa*, or *vidhāna-kalpa* (J. A. O. S. xi.378). In the ritual of the Atharvan the word *āṅgirasa* generally means 'pertaining to witchcraft.' Cf. also Rig-vidhāna iv.6.4.

² Four MSS. *āvraśkānpāñṇūn* ; one *-pāñṇūn*.

Dār. *vṛçcitā adanyāñçūn* (! for *vṛçcitādanyā-*?) *grhītvā badhakaparṇe baddhvā* (Cod. *vadhvā*) *bhraṣṭe* (!) *lokaprasiddhe kṣipati*.

'He ties shoots (of grass?) which have grown upon places where other grass has been torn off (?) into a leaf of the palāça-tree, and throws it into a frying-pan.'

29. *sphoṭatsu sṛtaḥ*.³

Dār. *çabda añçuṣu mṛto dveṣya iti jñeyam*.

'If the shoots sizzle (in the pan) then (the enemy) has been overthrown.'

The sūtra then proceeds to prescribe still more elaborate and potent charms for the purpose of bringing the enemy down. But these do not cast any additional light upon the hymn.

In considering the hymn itself the first verse may be left aside for the present, as it is peculiarly the one upon which the explanation as a fire ordeal has sprung up. The translation of the remaining verses is as follows :

2. 'Hear this, O ye revered gods! Bharadvāja sings praises to you for me. May he who injures this our plan be bound in fetters and joined to misfortune.'

Schlagintweit translates the pāda *yó asmākam māna idām hināsti* by 'der disen (unsern) geist beschädigt (d. i. schwur bezweifelt),' a translation and exposition absolutely arbitrary. Weber: 'Wer diesen meinen sinn beschädigt, d. i. meinen schwur antastet, mein wort bezweifelt.' Ludwig: 'der disen meinen sinn anklagt (verläumdet).'

3. 'Hear, O soma-drinking Indra, what with eager heart I clamor for. I cleave, as one cleaves a tree with an axe, him who injures this our plan.'

4. 'With the aid of thrice eighty sāman-singers, with the aid of the Adityas, Vasus, and Angirases—may the bliss of the (departed) fathers refresh us—do I seize this one with fateful grasp.'

Schlagintweit supplies 'firebrand' in the last pāda, and translates: 'nehme ich jenen (feuerbrand) an mich mit göttlicher inbrunst.' Weber, in still more direct adherence to the hypothesis of a fire-ordeal, supplies 'glühendes beil' with *amum*, and translates 'mit göttlicher gluth nehme ich diesen an mich.' Ludwig: 'jenen (den verläumder) erfasse ich mit der göttlichen glut.' Zimmer: 'halte ich jenen (? feuerbrand ? axt) mit göttlichem griff.' Grill: 'mit göttlich mächtigem griff erfass ich diesen.'

5. 'Heaven and earth kindle after me, may all gods assist me. O ye Angirases, O ye fathers delighting in soma, may he who does harm enter into misfortune.'

6. 'O ye Maruts, he who despises us, he who abuses the holy work that is being done (by us), may (our) zealous deeds be destructive for him, may the heavens burn the one hostile to holy acts.'

Then the poet takes the offensive; the metre changes. The passage is unmistakably employed in the sense claimed for the preceding verses

³ So two MSS; three *çṛtaḥ*; one *sṛtaḥ*; one *srutaḥ*; one *smṛtaḥ*.

by the diaskeuasts of the Atharvan, whatever the original purpose of its composition may have been.

7. 'I cut with my prayer your sevenfold breaths, your eightfold marrow ; go to the seat of Yama, fitly prepared with Agni as guide.

8. 'I set your foot-step upon the kindled fire. May Agni surround your body, may your voice go to the spirits.'

Schlagintweit translates pādas 3 and 4, doing violence to the sense by supplying two conjunctions not in the text, '(entweder) soll das feuer in deinen leib einkehren, (oder) deine rede gehe zu leben.' The sense he imagines to be: 'If the word of the accuser is true, then he shall remain unharmed ; if not, he shall be injured by fire.' Essentially in the same spirit are Weber's, Zimmer's, and Kaegi's renderings ; while Ludwig, though he regards the hymn as a fire-ordeal, translates: 'Agni umhülle deinen leib, selbst die stimme geh.'

In an essay entitled Seven hymns of the Atharva-Veda, American Journal of Philology, vol. vii.p.476 (p. 11 of the reprint), I have previously expressed my conviction that the last two verses of this hymn are verses adapted for this imprecation from the funeral ritual. Grill had previously expressed the same view on p. 50 of the work cited above, and this view is supported by certain other instances quoted in my article, in which the secondary employment of verses belonging to the burial service may be assumed with some degree of certainty.

The first verse is to be translated as follows: 'Heaven and earth and the broad mid-air, the goddess of the field and the wonderful (Viṣṇu), far-stepping one ; the broad mid-air, guarded by the wind : may these be inflamed when I am inflamed (with fury).'

Schlagintweit: 'May these be burned here, if I am burned.' So also Weber, Ludwig, and Zimmer. Grill correctly: 'Die sollen glühen wenn mich Glut verzehret.' The appeal to heaven and earth and the misinterpreted fourth pāda are really the sole cause of the hypothesis of a fire ordeal. The appeal to heaven and earth is in western minds strongly associated with asseverations of innocence. A similar construction of it for India is clearly unwarranted : at least this is certainly true so far as this hymn is concerned.

We must finally not ignore the negative evidence of the Kāuṣika so far as ordeals in general are concerned. Though the book is perhaps the most comprehensive encyclopædia of the manners and customs of India which we possess, there appears in it, as far as I am aware, no instance of an ordeal. There is mention however of a *prāyaścitta*-ceremony, which is performed for a person over whom an accusation or evil reports are pending. The passage is Kāuṣ. 46.1-3:

1. *utā 'mṛtāsuḥ śivās ta ity abhyākhyātāya prayacchati.* Dārila : *pratiśiddhakarmakartṛtenā 'bhiçastaḥ abhyākhyātāḥ tasmāi manthādanāu* (? Cod. *manthanāu*) *prāyacchati prāyaścittam* 'with AV. v.1.7 and vii.43.1 (etc.) one gives (a stirred drink and a porridge?) to the person accused (of the performance of forbidden deed), as a propitiatory act.'

2. *drughanaçiro rajivā badhnāti* 'one ties the head of an axe with a rope (to the accused person).'

3. *pratirūpam palācāyolohahiraṇyām*. Dārila: *drughaṇaṣiraḥsadr̥ṣaḥ pālācaḥ* (!) *prasiddhaḥ, ayaḥ kṛṣṇaloham, tāmraṁ hiraṇyaḥ suvarṇam etebhyaḥ drughaṇaṣira iva kṛtvā badhnāti, abhyākhyātaprāyaścittam* ' (that is) the image of an axe prepared out of palāca-wood, iron, copper, or gold is tied to the accused, as a propitiatory act.'

The entire performance seems to be undertaken for the purpose of reestablishing a soiled reputation. The amulet in the form of the head of an axe is perhaps intended to symbolize the act of cutting away or warding off the evil reports circulating about the person.

4. Notes on Part IV. of Schröder's edition of the *Māitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā*, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

It was one of the notable matters connected with the bringing to light of the *Māitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā* that there was found in it, for the first (and only) time in the whole Sanskrit literature, forms of the root *stigh*—a root catalogued by the Hindu grammarians, and vouched for as genuine by corresponding words in the other languages of the family. In the concluding part (1886) of Schröder's extremely valuable and scholarly edition of this treatise, he thinks to find yet another of the missing thousand or more of Hindu roots, in the following passage (iv. 1. 9; p. 12, l. 2 ff.): *té vāi devās tāṁ nā 'vīdan yāsmīn yajñāsya krūrām ā r k ṣ y ā m a h ā iti: sō 'gnīr abravīd ahām vas tāṁ janayīṣyāmi yāsmīn yajñāsya krūrām ā r k ṣ y ā d h v ā iti*; in the two verbs here he sees the root *r̥kṣ*, to which the value 'harm' is given in the root-lists. It would seem hardly necessary to call in such a root, with a sense so little adapted to the connection; the forms in question might be forced out of one of the familiar roots *rc* or *arc*, *r̥c*, or *r̥ṣ*. But it is also clear that the text needs only a very slight amendment to yield a far more acceptable meaning. By supplying in each case a missing *anusvāra*-dot, we get *krūrām mār̥kṣ*-, or future forms of the root *m̥r̥j*, middle voice; and the passage means: 'The gods did not find one "on whom," as they said, "we shall wipe off the cruelty of the sacrifice." Agni said: "I will produce for you one on whom ye shall wipe off the cruelty of the sacrifice;"' and he goes on to produce successively Ekata, Dvita, and Trita. The legend is not distinctly followed out in the passage here; but a verse of the Atharva-Veda (vi. 113.1) says: *tritē devā am̥r̥jatāi 'tād énaḥ* 'the gods wiped off that guilt on Trita'; and the analogy between the two passages establishes beyond question the readings *mār̥kṣyāmahe, mār̥kṣyādhve* in the former (futures of this form from *√m̥r̥j* occur also elsewhere), and guides us in the understanding of the sequel of the paragraph.

The text of the *Māitrāyaṇī* in this book especially is in a rather unsatisfactory condition, needing to be bettered at many points: as is testified by the considerable list of corrections and conjectural emendations (some of them venturesome) furnished (partly by Roth) at the end of the volume. A few more may be here suggested.

At 37.1 (for convenience, references are made to page and line), the

imperfect *anudyanta* is not to be tolerated; no Brāhmaṇa would co-ordinate it with the preceding aorist *ādhuḥḥṣata*: read instead *anutsata*, which is even rather nearer to what the MSS. give. So at 101.2, in the apodosis of a sentence having an optative in its protasis, we must absolutely have the optative *ricyeta*: there is no exception in the older language to the rule that the mode, whether optative or subjunctive or conditional, is the same in both members of such a sentence. Perhaps, indeed, in this passage *ricyate* is a misprint for *ricyeta*. In a like case at 89.8, *abhīpadyata* is doubtless a misprint for *-dyeta*. At 23.3, we must amend *satyād* to *sasyād*: 'but he should keep awake till sunrise; if he should fall asleep, he would meet with mishap.' The reading of part of the MSS., to be sure, given in the margin, would suggest the equivalent *svapyād* instead of *sasyād*; perhaps this was also Roth's emendation, misprinted as *svapnād* in the errata. At 138.6, *arātsyam* must be made *arātsam*, aorist, as one of the MSS. reads. At 136.5, *bruvāma* is no form; read *bravāma* (with part of the MSS.): though *brūyāma* would suit the context still better. At 122.10, *prādur* is inadmissible; *prā dur* would answer grammatically; but the sense seems rather to call for *pārā dur*. At 3.11, *mārṣan* should doubtless be *mā riṣan*: compare such passages as A.V. ii. 6.2; confusions of *r* with *ri* etc. are, as every one knows, common and persistent in the MSS. So for *hryāte* at 115.15, which is no form, *hriyāte* should of course be read; nor can it be questioned that at 185.2 we ought to have *hradām* instead of *hṛdām*. For the impossible *surāmṇām*, at 191.2, we must read, with TB. in the corresponding passage (ii. 6.11¹⁰), *suṭrāmāṇām*. So at 77.3, *adhṛṣṇuvat* is no form; read *adhṛṣṇuvant*, 'they did not venture to fall upon him' (the alteration of *tām nā* to *tān nā* in the errata is a mistake). And a little above, at 77.1, *ny ākāmāyata* should be changed to *-yanta*. At 31.7, *tēna* is to be divided and accented *tē nā*; and at 27.4 and 29.14, *nāme* is rather *nā me* (cf. Āpast. xiii. 7.13; where, instead of the anomalous *dambhiṣar*, we have the equally strange *dambhiṣag*). At 36.15, the sequel plainly shows that *srāvatā bhūtim* should be *srāvatā 'bhūtim*. At 44.1, it was wrong to change *samūhya* of the MSS. into *samāhya*, since *-ūhya* is repeatedly met with as gerund of *√ūh*. There can be little question that at 30.4,7 the true reading is *āidō* and *āidī*, instead of *dāidō* and *dāidī*. At 112.11, read *ēti* for *iti*. At 49.14, the reading *asī rājā pūnyaḥ* seems impossible; the MSS. authority favors rather *āsīd* for *asī*; and this might pass. At 22.9, the double punctuation mark after *juhuyāt* breaks the sense. At 2.6, *pretvarīyā* cannot be right; if not *pretvarī* simply, it may be *pretvarī vā* (for *vaḥ*). At 97.13, must we not emend to *mithundām vā agniḥ ca pātnī ca?* and, at 25.16, *vāsu* for *vāsur*? At 23.12 *tvadānī* is, of course, a misprint for *tvadānīm*: it is very curious to find *tvadānīm* . . . *tvadānīm* unaccented, as *tvat* . . . *tvat* would be. Other misprints are *randhāyanāṇa* for *-māna* (57.8); *-rājānāms* for *-rājānām* (62.2); *ādāyād ātha* for *ādāyādā 'tha* (85.2); *dogdhavyām* for *dogdhavyām* (5.5); *tātvā* for *tatvā* (6.1); *krīto* for *krīto* (27.12; cf. *krīto* in l. 16); *caturthē* for *caturthe* (101.12: second time); *metavyāḥ* for *metavyāḥ* (105.7); *īṣa* for *īṣe* (107.11); *svaḥ* for *svaḥ*

(109.1); *samsādyamānāya* for *-sādyām-* (180.4). Finally, the rules as to the accent of verbs are in general so well and consistently followed that we are justified in removing by emendation the occasional violations of them that appear. Thus, we may venture to read *visṛjante* for *visṛjānte* at 8.5, 6; *īṭe* for *īṭe* at 25.14; *bhavanti* for *bhāvanti* at 32.1; *anūpanamati* for *anūpanamati* ib.; *abhavat* for *ābhavat* at 35.9; *bhavati* for *bhāvati* at 46.14; *abhi śiñcati* for *abhiśiñcāti* at 53.17; *niravadayate* for *niravadāyate* at 54.9; *īcāte* for *īcāte* at 64.16; *pratitiṣṭhanti* for *prātiṣṭhanti* at 73.10; *mathyate* for *mathyāte* at 81.10; *grhṇāti* for *grhṇāti* at 84.8; *ṛchet* for *ṛchet* at 87.19; *syāt* for *syāt* at 93.5; *bhānti* for *bhānti* at 96.16; *āstām* for *āstām* at 106.8; *gamayati* for *gamāyati* at 114.18. In some of these cases, an error of the press is by no means unlikely.

5. An explanation; by Prof. Edward W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr, Penn.

In regard to a note on p. 1 of the last Proceedings,* in which Mr. Hopkins suggested that Prof. Bühler ought to have mentioned the name of Dr. Burnell in connection with his argument on the date of the early commentators of Manu, the following explanation of the facts was presented: 'I have received a note from Professor Bühler, explaining that his statement as to not having read the Translation of Burnell was misinterpreted by me so as to exclude Burnell's Introduction to the Translation, and I therefore gladly admit that Prof. Bühler, having no knowledge of Burnell's use of the argument based on *pūre*, etc., was fully entitled to present it as his own.'

6. On Proverb-literature; by Prof. Hopkins.

Three Sanskrit proverbs were quoted as of possible interest to those engaged on the general literature of proverbs. The first was the Epic version (MBh. vii.11.50-51) of our 'Man proposes, God disposes,' and runs as follows:

*anyathā cintitā hy arthā narāis tāta manasvibhiḥ
anyathāiva prapadyante dāivād iti matir mama.*

'Wise men plan affairs in one way, but they are disposed of by the power divine in quite another way.' Similarly, Hitopadeṣa ii.12 or 13,

*karotu nāma nītijño vyavasāyam itas tataḥ
phalam punas tad evāsya yad vidher manasi sthitam.*

Our 'Golden Rule' finds its negative equivalent in the words (MBh. v.39.72-3):

*na tat parasya saṁdadhyāt pratikūlaṁ yad ātmanaḥ
saṁgrahenāiṣa dharmāḥ syāt (kāmād anyāḥ pravartate).*

'To express the whole law in one word: do not do to another what is unpleasing to thyself.'

* Page 1 of Proceedings for May, 1887, = Journal, vol. xiii. p. cc.

Another version (Pañcatantra, iii.103 or 104) slightly differs : 'Hear the whole essence of the law : do not practice on others what is unpleasing to thyself' (*ātmanaḥ pratikūlāni pareṣāṇa na samācaret*). See Böhtlingk's *Indische Sprüche*², no's 3253 and 6579.

The most interesting case of accidental similarity was found in the Sanskrit almost verbal equivalent of the Greek proverb given by the Scholiast to Antig. 620, and which (Vell. Paterc. ii.118, Publ. Syr. 490; cf. Frg. Lykurg. adv. Leok. §92) ultimately reaches us in the familiar *Quos deus perdere vult dementat prius*. The Scholiast's version is more elaborate :

ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων ἀνδρὶ πορσίνη κακὰ
τὸν νοῦν ἐβλάψῃ πρῶτον (ὥ βουλεύεται).

Cf. MBh. ii.81.8 :

*yasmāi devāḥ prayacchanti puruṣāya parābhavam
buddhiṃ tasyāpakarṣanti* (so 'vācīnāni paçyati).

Greek : 'When the divinity prepares evil for any man, he is wont (aor.) to injure first the understanding of him (against whom he plots).' Sanskrit : 'If the divinities prepare destruction for any man, they are wont (pres.) to remove the mind of him (and he beholds things inverted, thinks crookedly).'

The correspondence in sense, arrangement, and word was shown ; and, as exhibiting the meaning of the last clause in the Sanskrit version, another version in Sanskrit (MBh. vi.98.17) was quoted. (Bhīṣma is speaking to Duryodhana.)

*mumūrṣur hi naraḥ sarvān vṛkṣān paçyati kāñcanān
tathā tvam api (gāndhāre) viparītāni paçyasi*.

'A man who is about to die thinks every tree golden; so thou too thinkest crookedly (art about to perish).' Evidently proverbial, as the like passages in Theognis and elsewhere show this κλεινὸν ἔπος to have been in Greece.

7. Recovery and publication of Tatian's Diatessaron ; by Prof. A. L. Frothingham, Jr., of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.

Tatian, the friend and pupil of Justin, on joining the ranks of the Gnostics, returned to Syria, his native land, about 166 A. D., and there wrote a Gospel-harmony or *Εὐαγγέλιον διὰ τεσσάρων*. This work, which doubtless supplied a much-felt want, soon became extremely popular in that part of the East, coming into general private and public use, and being read in the churches in place of the Gospels themselves. This is shown in a well-known passage in Theodoret, who reports that he had confiscated about 200 copies of it in his diocese. S. Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron shows that its popularity had lasted from the second until well into the fourth century. The learned Maronite, Assemani, who did so much for the formation of the Oriental department of manuscripts at the Vatican, brought back from Egypt,

early in the last century, a MS. containing the Arabic version of a Gospel harmony that claimed to be the Diatessaron ; this lay unnoticed until attention was called to it about four years ago by a learned Roman Orientalist, Padre Agostino Ciasca, especially known for his publications of Coptic and Tibetan texts. Doubts were expressed in Germany as to the genuineness of the work for two reasons. Tatian's Diatessaron is known to have omitted the genealogy of Christ, for Gnostical reasons, and to have commenced with the Gospel of John ; now the Vatican Arabic MS. contained the genealogies, and commenced not with John but Matthew. These doubts have, however, been dissipated by the discovery in Egypt, about a year ago, of a second MS., now in Prof. Ciasca's hands, which, while otherwise according with the first Vatican codex, complies with the conditions, as it does not contain the genealogies, and gives the first place to St. John. This fact and the various readings show that these two manuscripts were copied, both at nearly the same period, XIV.-XV. century, in Egypt, from different originals. The original of the first Vatican codex was probably later and had suffered from interpolations ; that of the former had better preserved the status of the Diatessaron. Professor Ciasca expects to publish in Rome, during the winter, the Arabic text with a Latin translation, and has granted me the privilege of issuing, contemporaneously, an English version.

It is not easy to ascertain when the Syriac original of the Diatessaron was lost. Bar Salibi was probably familiar with it in the XII. century, but Ebed-yeshu, in his catalogue, confounds it with a harmony attributed to Ammonius of Alexandria, and Bar-ebraia evidently spoke of it on hearsay. For the Latin harmony attributed to Tatian by Victor of Capua, a writer of the V. century, see this writer's *Præfat. ad Anonymi Harmoniam Evangelicam*. Only a careful comparison can prove what it is most probable to suppose—that the original of Victor of Capua's harmony is the same as that of this Arabic version.

8. On a Syriac manuscript of *The Order of Obsequies*, with a translated extract therefrom ; by Prof. I. H. Hall, of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.

This MS. is on paper, in original binding of thick boards covered with leather, now somewhat dilapidated ; it contains 148 leaves (296 pages), written in beautiful Nestorian, pretty well rubricated and somewhat ornamented here and there, about 19 lines to the page, lines running clear across. Size of written page, $6 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches ; of book, $9 \times 7 \times 2\frac{1}{4}$. The contents may be given in the words of the Colophon : ' Finished, by the help of our Lord, the *Order of Obsequies of Every Sort*, Men, Women, Youths, and all ages and all conditions—in the goodness of his mercy. Yea and Amen. This book was completed and brought to an end with exactness in the year of the blessed Greeks 2046, on the 5th day of the month Ab, on the 4th Tuesday of Summer [i. e. Tuesday, 5th August, A. D. 1735]. And it was written and brought to an end in the blessed region of Targawar, in the blessed village of Darband . . . by Priest Warda, son of the late Lazarus, one of the sons of Mar John, bishop

of Adorbigan.' The MS. is one of those recently acquired by the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

'In the name of Him who liveth and dieth not, we write the Ritual of Washing the Departed.

'First they set the face of him who has departed towards the East, and when they are about to wash him they sign him between the eyes [idiomatic for 'on his forehead'] with the sign of the cross. And next they wash his head and his face, and his whole neck as far as the spine, according to the redemptive word [this refers to ritual formulas explained in other parts of the MS.]. And next they wash his right hand as far as the elbow, and in like manner also the left hand. And then they make him sit up, and they throw water upon his right shoulder, and wash his whole side as far as his knees; and in like manner also his left side. And next they lay him upon the spine of his back, and wash his bed [if the scribe has not made a mistake of one letter, which would make it read 'belly'] and all his members. And next they lay him upon his face, and wash his feet, from his knees downward. And next they make him sit up, and they take water in a platter, and dash it upon his head three times, and clothe him in white garments, as in the days of his wedding [the wedding lasts from 7 to 14 days].

'But if he be a monk, they do not so, but they wash first from his head down to his spine; and then they wash his right hand as far as to its elbow, and his left hand in like manner. But they do not strip off his [monk's] garment from his body, but they throw water upon the garment, outside; and the one who washes him rubs his garment upon his body, on all sides, until the water runs off quite clear. And then they wash his feet downward from his knees. And then those who are present go out, and one who is familiarly associated with him remains with him in his place; and after his fellows have gone out, he strips off his clothing and puts other garments on him. But it is not right for him to bring in a cross with him, not at all, by no means; that he may not follow the fashion of those who covered up our Lord's cross [i. e., the worldly hypocrites].

'And know this, too, that in the rank in which he used to go to the altar while living, in that they should bring him to the grave. If he was a monk who had no grades by which to go to the altar, let them bring him in thus according to the rank of his monkhood. But if he be one distinguished above the multitude, a light, as he used to stand in the service of the church, in that manner let them bring him to the grave.

'And when they wash the departed, whoever he be, let them say over him the service of the washing, in the house of the departed or upon the roof; or if there be no place there, perform it in the church, as it is written in the rubric of the departed. And when they carry him out, begin the *Qala* of the way; and let his head go foremost, as it were leaving peace to the people of the house. And when they have gone outside of the village, put him on a bier in a pure place, and finish three dirges. And then take him up and carry him, with *Qala* and responses, the priests and the people preceding him, until they come

beside the grave. And when they begin the *Qala* of the approach, *Maran atha*, let pass the bier first, and the priests and the people after the bier, until they come to the grave. And put the dead on the right-hand side of the grave, and the priests keeping his feet and their faces toward the grave. And when they have finished the three prescribed dirges, lower the departed into the grave. And when the prescribed order is finished, let the priest throw a little dust into the grave ; but not in the form of a cross, as foolish people do ; and let them bury completely the dead, and pray for the sinner.'

It is worthy of remark, however, that the church canons, given in sundry places (e. g. in Lagarde's *Reliquiae Juris Ecclesiastici Antiquissimae*, C. Kayser's *Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa*), say that washing the dead is not very proper.

9. On certain Babylonian objects ; by Rev. Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York City.

One of the objects shown was a sardonyx disk twenty-two millimeters in diameter, so cut as to expose an outer circle of white, within that a circle of light brown, and in the center a circle of darker brown, the whole resembling the cornea, iris, and pupil of the eye. Very delicately cut in the iris is an inscription stating that Nebuchadnezzar dedicated it to his god Nebo. This was, then, the eye of an idol of Nebo, set up by Nebuchadnezzar. A few such objects are known in continental museums, notably one which was for sometime supposed to contain a cameo head of Nebuchadnezzar, but which Menant showed had come into the possession of a Greek artist, who had utilized the convenient stone to cut a cameo head within the earlier inscription dedicating the eye to Merodach.

A second object exhibited was in bronze, and shaped as a pendant, about four centimeters in length by three in width. On one side is figured a goddess holding a ring, seated in a chair over a griffin. Before her is a bearded worshiper. On the other side are two griffins rampant, and above them the familiar seven dots, or stars.

Photographs were also presented of a copper object now offered for sale in Constantinople, which is one of the most ambitious forgeries yet produced in the East. It takes the form of a small altar, or table. It is not more than three inches long by two and a half wide and an inch thick, and is supported on four legs of oxen. From each of the two opposite longer sides there project two heads of oxen. The top and two ends not occupied by the oxen's heads are filled with scenes in relief, precisely like those produced on a flat cast taken from a Babylonian or Assyrian cylinder. The photograph allows us distinctly to recognize the two scenes on the top of the altar. The upper one is Assyrian in style, and shows Gisdubar holding up with each hand a griffin by the hind leg. The forgery instantly appears in the fact that the elaborate Assyrian sacred tree is divided exactly longitudinally through the middle, so that half of it appears at each end of the scene, as if it were an architectural ornament. An inscription declares this to be the 'seal' (*kunuk*) of the owner Zabri. The date of this sea

would be about the time of Sargon. Below it is a characteristic Babylonian scene, representing Gisdubar and other heroes fighting wild beasts, of a period a thousand years older than the Assyrian one. The two cylinders from which these forgeries were copied can fortunately be identified. They are both now in the possession of the Rev. Henry Fairbanks, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., for whom the very fine Assyrian one was bought only four years ago, from the head-dress of a woman in Urfa. Rubbings, after the Turkish style, which would easily divide the sacred tree, were sent to a man in Constantinople, who pretended to read the inscription, and pronounced it of fabulous value.

10. On the meaning of the design on the stone tablet of Abu-Habba; by Rev. Dr. Ward.

This famous tablet contains, above a long inscription, the figure of a god, under a canopy. Before him is an altar, or table, with a large disk of the Sun upon it, held upright by cords in the hands of two small figures above. A man is led into the presence of the god, and is followed by a beardless personage. Three epigraphs describe the scene. One of these, in the vacant space to the left, tells us that this is 'the image (*Salam*) of the Sun-god, the great lord, dwelling (or sitting, *ashib*) in Ebara, which is within Sippara.' If the word *Salam* can refer only to an image in the human form, and not to the great disk upon the table, then this epigraph refers especially to the seated god, or, rather, to the whole scene, of which he is the chief object. Under the whole scene is a stream, or sea of water, with four circles in it figured with the conventional representations of Venus. Above the canopy, or shrine, is an epigraph not yet satisfactorily read, but which may possibly be explained by comparison with the objects figured. First is mentioned 'the Moon-god, the Sun-god, and Istar.' These refer, of course, to the three common symbols of Sin, Shamash, and Ishtar immediately under this epigraph. Next come the words *ina pût apsu*, of which the word *apsu*, abyss, or ocean, is clear. This must be the water at the bottom of the design. The second line has the words *ina birit Siru timeru mesrit* (?). Here Siru is the great Serpent-god. He ought to be represented, and I think he is to be identified with the covering of the shrine. It rises from the waters behind the seated Sun-god, bends over his head, and reaches to the top of the column. It seems to have the head of a serpent clearly drawn, though not hitherto noticed. May the *timeru* mentioned afterwards be the palm-tree (Heb. *tamar*) column in front of the god? The word *timeru* is applied in Assyrian to a column of smoke. Here the serpent, forming a canopy about the god, will be the same world- and ocean-encircling serpent that appears encompassing the bowl of Palestrina. Within the shrine, and over the god's head, is a small epigraph, of which the first line reads *Agu* (D P) *Shamash*. This I would translate 'Circle (ring, disk) of Shamash.' This cannot refer to his tiara, but only, I think, to the ring which he holds in his hand. The second line is not easy to translate. It seems to read *mushshi* II, and is translated by Pinches 'the two attendants.' The two vertical wedges I would not make a

numeral, but the sign for *ditto*, and I suppose it repeats the *Shamash* of the line above, which there was not room to write out again in full. It would then denote 'the *mushshi* of *Shamash*,' and the object indicated is probably the divining rod, scepter, or whatever the stick is, which the Sun-god holds in the same hand with the ring.

Large stone disks, to be compared with that figured on the table, have been described by Prof. J. A. Paine as existing in Moab. The third of the three figures approaching the altar is Aa, the wife of Shamash. The wife of a deity, if she have not, like Ishtar, any marked character to distinguish her, is generally represented, in Babylonian art, as dressed in a long goat's-hair garment, often flounced, with a divine head-dress, and with both hands lifted in an attitude of respect. A human worshiper generally lifts but one hand.

11. On the Babylonian inscribed tablets at Harvard University; by Prof. D. G. Lyon, of Cambridge, Mass.; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

This paper gave an account of some tablets and fragments recently acquired by Harvard University. They are all of the class usually known as contract or commercial tablets, giving accounts of sale, barter, loans, etc., of the ancient Babylonians. The only other collection of the kind in America is the one in the Metropolitan Museum, in New York, part of which was acquired from England some years ago, but most of which was brought home by the American exploring party in 1885. The British Museum contains many thousand, and Dr. Strassmaier is now engaged in publishing about 900 from the times of Nabonidus. The study of tablets of this class has been much neglected; but here it is that the material is found for reconstructing the private and social life of the people. The newly acquired Harvard tablets are from the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-Merodach, Neriglissar, Nabonidus, Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius.

12. On a study-collection of casts of Assyrian and Babylonian antiquities in the National Museum at Washington; by Dr. Cyrus Adler, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The National Museum at Washington has undertaken the formation of a study-collection of casts of Assyrian and Babylonian antiquities, in association with the Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore. The Museum stands ready to make fac-similes and casts of Assyrian and Babylonian antiquities. An attempt is being made to first obtain copies of the Assyrian antiquities, preserved in this country. The Johns Hopkins University will attend to the proper arrangement and cataloguing of the Assyrian collection in the National Museum, under the supervision of Dr. Paul Haupt, Professor of Shemitic languages, and Dr. Cyrus Adler, Assistant in the Shemitic courses, who will also coöperate in the work of forming the collection and of securing the loan of objects to be copied. Three sets of fac-similes and casts will be made in each case, the first to be preserved in the National Museum at Washington; the second to be transferred to the Shemitic Library of the Johns Hopkins University; and the third to be presented to the owners of objects loaned.

13. On the death of Sennacherib and the accession of Esarhaddon; by Dr. Cyrus Adler.

In 2 Kings xix.³⁷ the following account is given of the death of Sennacherib: "And he was worshiping in the house of Nisroch¹ his God; and Adrammelech and Sharezer [his sons] smote him with the sword; and they escaped to the land of Ararat; and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead." Isaiah xxxvii.³⁸ is a repetition of this sentence, while 2 Chronicles xxxii.²¹ less accurately says that after the destruction of Sennacherib's army before Jerusalem "he returned in shame to his land, and he entered the house of his God, and those who came out of his bowels cast him down with the sword." Professor Friedrich Delitzsch in the article on Sennacherib in the *Calwer Bibellexikon* also refers to Nahum's prophecy (i.14) against Nineveh, where we read "And the Lord hath given a commandment concerning thee that no more of thy name be sown; out of the house of thy Gods will I cut off the graven image and the molten image; I will make thy grave, for thou art vile." But it is by no means clear that the passage cited has any relation either to this period or to the death of Sennacherib.

Josephus, on the authority of Berossus, gives a statement in agreement with 2 Kings: "He was treacherously assaulted, and died by the hands of his elder sons Adrammelech and Seraser, and was slain in his own temple which was called Araske."² Polyhistor asserts that "Sinnacherim . . . reigned 18 years, and was cut off by a conspiracy which had been formed against his life by his son Ardu-Musanus."³

The account of Abydenus differs materially from all of these. He says "next in order after him (Sennacherib) reigned Nergilus, who was assassinated by his son Adramelus; and he also was slain by Axerdes, his brother by the same father but of a different mother, who pursued his army and shut it up in the city of the Byzantines. Axerdes was the first that levied mercenary soldiers, one of whom was Pythagoras, a follower of the wisdom of the Chaldeans; he also reduced under his dominion Egypt."⁴

As a matter of curiosity, since of course no historical importance attaches to them, the accounts in the apocryphal Book of Tobit, whose scene is laid at this period, may be mentioned. Tobit gives in the different versions somewhat varying accounts of the affair. The Chaldee

¹ No deity named Nisroch has been found in the Assyro-Babylonian pantheon. Joseph Halévy has suggested (*Mélanges de critique et d'histoire relatifs aux peuples sémitiques*, p. 177) that we should read instead of נִסְרוֹךְ corresponding to the name of the Babylonian God Nusku, constr. *Nusuk* נִסְוֶךְ. See also Haupt, *Andover Review*, July, 1884, p. 93; Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, i.230; Tiele, 325.

² Antiquities of the Jews, x.1.5. The Greek MSS. give the name of the god in various forms as Asarac, Mesoroc, Nasaroc (see Dean Stanley, *History of the Jewish Church*, ii.531.6), a diversity which lends support to Halévy's emendation.

³ Eusebius, *Armen. Chron.*, 42. Cory's *Ancient Fragments* (London, 1876), p. 87.

⁴ Euseb., *Armen. Chron.*, 52. Cory, *Ancient Frag.*, 89. It is difficult to get at the real meaning of this confused statement; Schrader KAT.² 330.

Version (ed. Neubauer, Oxford, '78) reads " But he hid before him five and forty days, until that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons killed him with the sword, and they fled in to the land of Kardu (so too the Targum Jonathan), and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead." The Hebrew version gives a reason for the parricide. " The God of Israel delivered him into the hand of his two sons, and they slew him with the sword. For he asked his counsellors and his elders why the Holy One (blessed be he) had been jealous for Israel and Jerusalem, and the angel of the Lord had destroyed the host of Pharaoh, and all the first-born of Egypt, and the young men by whose hand the Lord always gave them salvation. And his wise men and his counsellors said unto him, Abraham, the father of Israel, led forth his son to slay him, peradventure he might thereby obtain the favor of the Lord his God ; therefore hath he been jealous for his children and hath executed vengeance upon thy servants. Then the king said, I will slay my two sons for the Lord's sake, peradventure I may obtain by them God's favor, and he will help me. And the saying came to Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons, and they lay in wait for him, and killed him with the sword, at the hour when he went in to pray before his idol Dagon, as it is said, etc." The Itala reads : *et contigit dum laterem post dies quadraginta quinque occiderunt regem illum duo filii sui, et fugerunt in montem Ararat̃h.*"

Until recently this was all the information we possessed concerning the death of Sennacherib. About three years ago there was discovered in the British Museum a series of interesting tablets appropriately called the Babylonian Chronicle, which furnished brief statements concerning the kings of Babylonia and Assyria from about 747 to 667 B.C. The Babylonian Chronicle was known only in a paraphrase published by Mr. T. G. Pinches (Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, May 6, 1884) until last spring, when Dr. Hugo Winckler published the text with transliteration and translation in the Journal of Assyriology (II ZA 157).⁵ Col. iii.34 we read, *Arah Tebētu ūmu XX Sinaherba šar Aššūr apū-šu ina sihi idūk šanāti Sinaherba šarrūt Aššūr epuš.* ' On the twentieth day of the month Tebeth Sennacherib, king of Assyria, was killed by his son in an insurrection ; . . . years Sennacherib exercised the government of Assyria.'

So much then is settled ; Sennacherib was murdered, and by one sprung from his own loins⁶ (2 Chronicles). As against the statement in 2 Kings that he was murdered by his two sons (confirmed by Berossus

⁵ Now published again by Pinches, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, xix.655.

⁶ It is characteristic of the way in which some Assyriologists work that Dr. Winckler did not seem to notice the force of this nor of the following statements in the Chronicle, nor does he seem to have recognized the name of Samaria in the text (see Delitzsch, review of the German edition of Sayce's *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments* in the *Literarisches Centralblatt*, Sept. 17, 1887). I shall notice Dr. Winckler's remarks on these points made in the September number of the Munich Journal of Assyriology (just received), in the April number of *Hebraica*.

in Josephus), we have first Polyhistor (who mentions but one son, Ardu-Musanus), the rather confused account of Abydenus, and finally the Babylonian Chronicle. If compelled to choose between the two names, it would be difficult to say where the weight of evidence lies.

Column iii. line 36 of the Babylonian Chronicle continues: *ištu ūmu XX ša arah Tebētu adī ūmu II ša arah Adaru sīhu ina Aššūr sadir*, 'From the twentieth day of the month Tebeth (December-January) till the second day of the month Adar (February) there was an organized insurrection in Assyria.'

Although before the discovery of the Babylonian Chronicle there never existed any direct cuneiform evidence of the murder of Sennacherib, yet there were two texts which were connected with this event. First, the so-called will of Sennacherib,⁷ in which he made a special bequest to Esarhaddon, thus designating him as his favorite and thereby arousing the jealousy of his elder brothers; and secondly, the beginning of the Prism inscription of Esarhaddon,⁸ the opening lines of which are unfortunately lost, which has generally been considered an account of the triumph of Esarhaddon over the murderer or murderers of his father. In this inscription the impetuosity of Esarhaddon is expressed in the phrases: *išten ūmi šinā ūme ul uqqi, pān šābē'a ul adgul, arkā ul āmur piḡitti sise šimitti nīri ul unūt tahāzī'a ul ašūr šidīt girrī'a ul ašpuk raggu kuššu*^{8a} *arah S'abāti dannat kušši ul ādur*, 'One day, two days, I did not wait. The front of my soldiers I did not look at; the rear I did not see; the attendance of the horses, the harnessing of the chariots, the implements of battle I did not inspect. Provision for my campaign I did not heap up. The furious storm of Shebat (January-February), the rage of the tempest I did not fear.'

The course of events, then, seems to have been as follows: On the twentieth of Tebeth (December-January) Sennacherib was murdered. In the month of Shebat (January-February) Esarhaddon marched against the rebels. What the government of Assyria was during that time we do not know, though we are informed that the disturbance lasted until the second of Adar (February-March). Esarhaddon, according to the inscription, had a very easy time in overcoming the rebels. *Istar belit qabal tahāzi rā'imat šangūtī'a idā'a tāziz-ma qašatsunu tašbir tahāzā šunu raksu tapṭur-ma ina puhrišunu iqbū umma annū šarrāni*, 'Istar, Lady of the battle field, who loves my sacerdotal royalty, stood at my side and broke their bows. She broke through their compact battle-array, and they cried with one voice "This is our king."' Yet according to the Babylonian Chronicle, he did not accede until the eighth of Sivan (May-June):⁹ *Arah Simānu ūmu VIII Ašurāhiddina ina Aššūr ina*

⁷ Cf. III. R. 16; Budge, *Hist. of Esarhaddon*, p. 4: [Tiele, p. 311, n. 4].

⁸ Cf. III R. 15; AL³ 117 No. 7. [8^a. See the Vienna ZKM. I, 199.]

⁹ Mr. Pinches (JRAS. l. c.), it is true, reads Adar for Sivan; but I have no hesitation, in view of other confirmatory facts, in accepting Winckler's reading. For the ideogram with phonetic complement rendered by *ittāšab*, Pinches puts the strange form *išab*. He is more accurate, however, in reading *kussū* for Winckler's *kussū*. [For *išab*, cf. Zimmern, pp. 54, 117.]

kussî ittāšab (iii.38). This would take the accession of Esarhaddon over to the year 680, though his father was murdered in the year 681. Moreover the Babylonian Chronicle expressly states that Esarhaddon reigned but twelve years: *XII šanāti Ašurahiiddina šarrūt Aššūr epuš* (iv.32). [Cf. Tiele's *Geschichte*, pp. 343, 615.]

From these statements we infer, first, that the account in the Bible and other ancient authors concerning the murder of Sennacherib is correct; and, second, that although Sennacherib was murdered in the year 681, his son Esarhaddon did not accede until the following year, 680.¹⁰ The absence of any evidence for these statements in the Assyrian Eponym Canon and their presence in the Babylonian Chronicle is explainable as an instance of the unwillingness of the Assyrians to put on record any statement showing disasters to their dynasties or breaks in the succession.

14. On the views of the Babylonians concerning life after death; by Dr. Cyrus Adler.

Among the vast series of facts which the excavation and decipherment of the cuneiform monuments brought to light, none were more eagerly awaited, and none have proved more fruitful from the point of view of culture-history and comparative mythology, than the information we have been enabled to glean concerning the religion of ancient Babylonia. Studies in religious history are always made with difficulty. The dogmatical statements of a church, the theoretical expoundings of the schools, and the form which these two assume under the influence of popular belief and popular superstition, must all be taken into account. Nor is the problem by any means simplified when we have, as in Babylonia, two distinct systems, of two distinct races, contending for mastery, or at all events but inharmoniously blended. As is well known, the entire religion of the ancient Egyptians has been unfolded by a careful study of their funeral rites and mortuary remains. And it is indeed a canon of Anthropology that investigators should pay especial attention, in studying the culture-history of any newly discovered people, to their funeral rites, and their views of life after death.¹ For no people, however degraded, have ever been discovered anywhere who have not indulged in some speculation upon this subject. Almost as soon as the decipherment of the Semitic cuneiform inscriptions was firmly laid, students commenced to search for the religious statements which they must needs reveal, a search which was materially aided by the discovery of a large number of distinctively religious texts in the so-called library of Assurbanipal (668-626 B. C.).

¹⁰ This agrees with the date required by the Canon of Ptolemy, and has been so given by Boscauwen PSBA. IV. 86. Budge, *Hist. of Esarhaddon*, p. 5. Pinches, PSBA. May 6, 1884, p. 198. Schrader, *Die keilinschriftliche babylonische Königtliste* in the *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, June 23, 1887, p. 29. It might be well to add that the Assyro-Babylonian year, as shown by the list of months (ASKT. 64), begins with Nisan.

¹ Cf. Reports of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology, vol. ii., pp. 89-199.

As early as 1871 Mr. H. Fox Talbot remarked:² "It is a question which I believe has hitherto not received any satisfactory answer, whether or not the Assyrians believed in the immortality of the soul and a future state of happiness? There is nothing, so far as I am aware, in the historical inscriptions which throws any light upon this subject, but on the clay tablets of the British Museum I have found two passages which I think indicate their belief with sufficient certainty. They are both prayers for the happiness of the king, first upon earth and afterwards in a future life." And later on, the same scholar thought that he had deduced the notion of the future punishment of the wicked. Both Mr. Talbot's assertions concerning the historical annals and his deductions from the liturgical texts were unfounded, yet they are here cited as the first expressions of opinion on the subject. To these statements Mr. W. St. Chad Boscawen lent considerable support by a discussion of the twelfth tablet of the Nimrod Epic and the Descent of Istar to Hades.³ And the historical works and manuals have in the main relied on the facts thus adduced. Dr. Alfred Jeremias, a pupil of Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, has recently, however, placed this whole matter on a sound basis.⁴ As was already recognized by Boscawen in 1875, the first great source for our knowledge of the Babylonian Hades is furnished by the text of the Descent of Istar. The connection in which this story is related is as follows: A man was in distress at the death of his sister, and longed for her release from Hades. He accordingly betook himself to a magician, who, to show him that his desire was not unattainable, told him the story of the descent of Istar: how Istar went down to obtain the release of her dead lover Tammuz; how she threatened to "smash the door-posts and pull out the doors" if she were denied admittance; how the keeper of the under-world takes her name to Allat, who is at first enraged but finally agrees to admit her, stipulating however, that she shall be stripped "according to the ancient rules." At each one of the seven gates Istar loses a garment or ornament, until finally she stands naked in the presence of Allat. To her Istar is indiscreet in her greeting, and by way of punishment is smitten with various diseases. But the effect of the absence of the goddess of love was disastrous to the upper world. All the processes of generation ceased. Ea, the god of unfathomable wisdom, created a being Uddușu-namir who was sent to Hades to procure the release of Istar. After some difficulty this was accomplished. Istar was sprinkled with the water of life and taken through the seven gates of Hades, her various garments and ornaments being restored to her as they passed through the respective gates. Accordingly the petitioner was advised to make a libation of pure water and precious oils to Tammuz. The same pur-

² PSBA., vol. ii, pp. 29 and 346.

³ TSBA., iv. 267.

⁴ *Die Babylonisch-Assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, nach den Quellen mit Berücksichtigung der alttestamentlichen Parallelen dargestellt von Dr. Alfred Jeremias, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1887.

pose furnishes the occasion for the most interesting tablet of the Nimrod-Epic, the eleventh tablet, containing the Babylonian account of the Deluge.

In the fifth and sixth tablets we learn how Nimrod freed Erech and ascended the throne; how Istar was inflamed with love for the hero, and how she, when rejected, applied to her father Anu to avenge her disgrace; how Nimrod was cursed by Istar, and how his friend Ea-bani, who cast further indignity upon the goddess, was at the request of the enraged Istar smitten with a fatal disease. The ninth table opens with the lament of Nimrod over Ea-bani, and his resolve to seek out his ancestor S'amaš-napištim to obtain the resurrection of his friend and immortality for himself. But he has an arduous task before him. After many difficulties the mountain of Máš is reached. In the historical inscriptions this name appears as the designation of the Syro-Arabian desert,⁵ but in the ancient period of which the poem treats it seems still to have been a *terra incognita*.

Next the adventures of the road are set forth, though unfortunately this portion is very much mutilated. In the last lines of col. v., Nimrod finds himself in a land of magnificent trees, and at the end of the sixth column he has arrived at the sea, where a new obstacle presents itself. And the obstacle at first seems insurmountable, for Nimrod says, "If it be possible I will cross the sea; and if it be not possible, I will stretch myself on the ground (in despair)." Sabit, the keeper of the waters, answered this appeal as follows: "Nimrod, there never has been a passage, and no one has ever been permitted to cross the sea. S'amaš the hero has crossed the sea, but beside S'amaš who can cross it? Hard is the passage, most difficult is its course, and closed are the waters of the dead which are placed around (like a moat). Why, O Nimrod, wouldst thou cross the sea? When thou approachest the waters of the dead, what wilt thou do then?"⁶ Nimrod, there is Arad-Ea, the ferryman of S'amaš-napištim.⁷ . . . If possible, cross with him; if not, after him." After a long passage over the river they come to the ocean, where is Arad-Ea's stopping place. Nimrod relates to Arad-Ea his woes, and begs the ferryman to take him across. Arad-Ea then gives Nimrod directions for the journey. For more than a month they cruise about in the waters of the dead. Then the real danger begins. Finally they approach the shore of the regions of the blessed. S'amaš-napištim gazes

⁵ Cf. V. R. viii. 87, 108; Delitzsch's *Paradies*, p. 242.

⁶ Izdubar is the provisional reading of the name of the hero. Most Assyriologists have followed George Smith in identifying him with Nimrod. There is no cuneiform evidence however for the reading *Namrádu*. Comp. *Proceedings* of our Society, May, 1887, p. xii.

⁷ Dr. Jeremias always reads this name *Pir-napištim*, following Delitzsch and Zimmern (cf. the latter's *Babylonische Busspsalmen*, p. 26: 1). To show the possibility of the reading *S'amaš-napištim* it will suffice to refer to II. R. 44, 5a, where the character *ut* without the determinative of divine names occurs as the equivalent of the Sun, followed by the ideogram of the air-god Rimmon. Cf. Strassm. No 7895.

at them in astonishment as they near his abode. Nimrod again relates his woes, tells of the countries, mountains and seas he has traversed, and questions him how it happened that he obtained immortality and access to the region of the blessed. Then S'amaš-napistim tells the "hidden story" of the great flood, how he alone was saved in universal destruction. After the close of the story of the deluge, S'amaš-napistim begins the cure of Nimrod, who was smitten with ulcers at the request of Istar. And the hero recovers his strength through a magical food and a magical sleep. After Nimrod is purified, the wife of S'amaš-napistim inquires, "What wilt thou give that he may return to his land." Thereupon S'amaš-napistim reveals the "secret and command of the gods," and shows the hero a plant which appears on the high trees and cliffs of the island. The name of this plant *šibu išsahir amelu*, indicates its magical power, 'which restores to a man already old his youth.' With this Nimrod could regain his former strength. But this boon was too precious, and on the return a lion-like demon snatched the plant out of his hand and carried it off to the sea.

So much for the legendary and possibly early views. In the prayers, on the other hand, scattered through the royal inscriptions, we find no indication of any longing after immortality. The blessings asked always pertain to this life. Tiglath-pileser I. (c. 1120-1110 B. C.) says of his grandfather Ašur-dân: "The work of his hands and the offering of his sacrifices pleased the gods, so that he arrived at the highest old age." Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, asked for long life and preservation from sin for himself and his son Belshazzar. Nebuchadnezzar^s prays for "length of days and victories." The punishments involved, too, always pertained to this world: "Whoso fears not his god, like a reed shall be cut off;" "The god Rimmon commanded that he should not live a single day;" "May his name be blotted out and his seed be destroyed;" "In distress and famine may they end their lives."

What the Assyrians did with their dead is a question by no means easy to answer. So far no graves or cemeteries have been found in the northern kingdom, though a special search was instituted by Layard, Loftus, Place, and Rassam. In fact, Place was driven to the assertion that possibly the Assyrians committed their corpses to the river, like the modern Hindus. Later, however, it was found that graves abounded in lower Chaldea, and so Mr. Loftus conjectured that lower Chaldea, and lower Chaldea only, was used as a burial place for the entire Mesopotamian empire. Recently doubt has been cast upon this theory, the age of the remains at Mugheir, Warka, and Tel-loh having been questioned. However that may be, the fact that the Babylonians and Assyrians did bury their dead is established beyond all doubt. Denial of burial, moreover, was considered a great misfortune. Against his rebellious vassal, the king of Lydia, Assurbanipal (668-626 B. C.) directs the curse, "May his corpse be cast before his enemies, may they drag away his bones." To Nabû-bel-zikre, who had cast himself upon his own sword, he

^s Borsippa Inscription (I.R. 51), Col. II., l. 25.

"did not grant burial." The Bellino Cylinder of Sennacherib plainly speaks of cemeteries and mausoleums. Moreover Sennacherib as well as Assurbanipal went to the trouble of disinterring the bones of the ancestors of their conquered enemies. But the whole matter is clearly put at the close of the Nimrod-Epic:

On a couch he reclineth drinking pure water,
 He who was killed in battle—
 (As) thou hast (often) seen it (and) I (too) have seen it—
 His father and mother support his head,
 And his wife standeth by his side.
 But he whose corpse was left upon the field—
 As thou hast seen it and I have seen it—
 His shade findeth no rest in the earth.
 Whose shade hath none that careth for him—
 As thou hast seen it and I have seen it—
 He is consumed in gnawing hunger,
 (In vain) he craveth food,
 What is cast in the street, he eateth.⁹

Of the funeral ceremonies, too, we have some inkling. Hired mourners and music accompanied the corpse to the grave, spices were placed on the bier, and libations were offered to the shades of the departed, while in agreement with the Israelitish custom the mourners wore torn garments. Epitaphs have not yet been found, though such existed, if we may credit the statement of Arrian that he saw cuneiform writing on the tomb of Sardanapalus (cf. Arrian II.5.3; Strabo XIV. 672; Athenaeus XII. 529 E).

What is generally recognized to be a pictorial representation of Hades is found on a bronze plaque acquired by M. Péretié at Hama in Northern Syria. Clermont-Ganneau was the first to assert that it represented the four divisions into which the Assyrians divided the Universe: heaven, atmosphere, earth, and Hades.¹⁰

The principal deities of the under-world¹¹ were Allat and Nergal,¹² and a host of demons, their satellites; the favorite messengers of Allat being *Namtâr* 'plague' and *Asakku* 'consumption (?)'

The inferences to be drawn, then, seem to be as follows: The Assyro-Babylonians believed in a future life. Reward and punishment, however, were as a rule awarded in the flesh. Death was the great leveler,

⁹ This passage, which was left untranslated by Dr. Jeremias and his predecessors, will be explained in Prof. Haupt's paper on the 12th tablet of the Nimrod-Epic in the first number of the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*.

¹⁰ See further Chipiez and Perrot, *History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria*, p. 357.

¹¹ The chief designations for the under-world in the Babylonian texts are *Aralû* *Ekur*, *S'u'ûlu* (Sheol), Delitzsch *Prolegomena* 145: 2 *Qabru* (the grave), *Kûtu* (because Nergal was divinity of both Cutha and Hades), *bît mâtî*, 'the house of the dead.' *Kur-nu-gia*, Assy. *eršit lá târat*, 'land whence none return,' etc.

¹² Akkadian *ne-uru-gal*, 'lord of the great city,' i. e. Hades.

and all went to the same place, a damp, dark, and uncomfortable abode. Even this, however, was denied those whose remains did not receive proper burial. For some few of the favorites of the gods, on the other hand, a happier fate was reserved. They were translated to the isles of the blessed, and seem to have continued enjoying the same sort of existence as they had in the upper world. The spirits of Hades "were clad like birds, in feathered garments;"¹³ but when Nimrod sees his ancestor, S'amaš-napištim, he remarks :

"Thy appearance¹⁴ is not changed; like me art thou.

And thou thyself art not changed; like me art thou."¹⁵

This life in the fields of the blessed was, however, a very exceptional thing. It is awarded in the poems to but a very few heroes, and is arrogated in an incantation to the priests, enchanter, and magicians. Resurrection was known. Istar was granted life, and Tammuz her lover annually burst the bonds of death. Moreover "the earth opened and the soul of Ea-bani came forth like a zephyr." And this possibility of resurrection furnished, as was remarked above, the occasion of the relation of the Descent of Istar and a portion of the Nimrod-Epic. It was but sparingly employed, however, and seems to have vested finally in Allat, the queen of the under-world, though the other gods were continually endeavoring to break her spell.

To attempt to trace the historical development of these somewhat contradictory views of the Babylonians concerning life after death, as set forth above, would in the present state of our knowledge concerning the date of the religious texts be a useless task, leading to no results which could in any way be considered certain.¹⁶

15. On a new system of transliteration for the Semitic sounds, based upon phonetic principles ; by Mr. Edgar P. Allen, University Fellow in Semitic, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Allen presented an abstract of his phonetic studies in connection with Prof. Paul Haupt's new system of transliteration for Semitic sounds. The distinctive features of this system are the following : All spirants are expressed by the corresponding stop-consonants with underscored line. This method, which has long and fitly been used with regard to the Arabic *ث* and *ذ*, may well serve to call to mind the Heb. *raphé* and its function. But the Arabic *غ*, hitherto rendered by *g*, *gh*, or *g'*, is also a spirant : viz. the voiced variety of the guttural spirant *خ*, and only a deeper variety of raphated *خ* ; it must, therefore, for uniformity's sake, also be rendered by the corresponding stop with underscored line.

¹³ Descent of Istar, Col. I, l. 10.

¹⁴ Assyrian *minātu*, pl. to *מין*; cf. Hebrew *תמונה* (Haupt).

¹⁵ Deluge (AL³ 101), lines 3 and 4.

¹⁶ See, however, Prof. A. H. Sayce's Hibbert Lectures, 1887, pp. 357-367.

An important matter is the transliteration of the so-called *emphatic* consonants, an expression which, doubtless, conveys to but few persons any very clear idea. These have been rendered variously, but, as a rule, by the corresponding simple consonant with a dot beneath. The peculiarity of these sounds is a combination of glottal catch with the mouth position. The glottal catch may follow the mouth position or may be simultaneous with it. There is a difference in different dialects and with different sounds. Since the sign of the glottal catch (or **ʔ**) is the so-called *spiritus lenis*, the best method of expressing the emphatic sounds is by the simple consonant with *spiritus lenis* or *çedilla* beneath. If the present Arabic pronunciation of the **ص** differing from **س** only in that its position is further back in the mouth and in the modification of a following vowel,—if that pronunciation be taken as the original, then the combination with glottal catch would be impossible; but the Jews pronounce the **ص** as an *affricata ts*, as do also the Abyssinians. And in such case the glottal catch might follow the simple consonant explosion. This seems to have been the original pronunciation; and therefore **ص** or **س** should be indicated by *s* with *çedilla*, or better by *ç*, which sign has the advantage of at once classing the **ص** in the right category and of indicating its present pronunciation. The **ظ** is to be treated in the same way, since it was originally as now but the voiced variety of the **ص**. This subject of **ص** and **ظ**, however, deserves further study and investigation.

The unpointed **ح** has heretofore been rendered by *h*, and has thus been classed with the emphatic consonants, from which it is entirely different. It is a *laryngeal*, and may be considered as a stronger variety of the aspirate *h*. As such it is best rendered by the double *spiritus asper*, or by *h* with *spiritus asper* beneath, which amounts to the same thing and is to be preferred for clearness' sake.

The **خ** again is totally unlike both **ح** and *h*. It is the deeper variety of the ordinary German *ach-laut* and is best rendered by the sign *x*, which is commonly used for the purpose by Indo-European philologists.

Mr. Allen's phonetic studies will be published in full in a future number of the American Journal of Philology.

16. Announcement of a new Assyrian-English Glossary; presented on behalf of the Semitic Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, by Mr. Edgar P. Allen.

At the last meeting of the Oriental Society, Prof. Lyon took occasion to discuss the first part, recently published, of Prof. Delitzsch's great Assyrian Dictionary, which had been announced as early as 1879, and since then eagerly expected by all who are interested in Semitic studies and especially by all Assyriologists. Since its appearance, the first fascicle has been much reviewed and commented on from all sides, with qualified praise sometimes, and sometimes with unqualified condemnation. There is a long step from the standpoint of Delitzsch's admirers to that of his adversaries—between the opinion, on the one

hand, that "for the preparation of such a work no one is so well qualified as the professor of Assyriology at Leipzig," and the opinion, on the other hand, that "he is quite unqualified for the task he has undertaken." However, even in the eulogy of so enthusiastic a follower of Delitzsch as is Prof. Lyon, a sober critic may read here and there between the lines signs of a slight disappointment. Without calling in question for a moment the undoubted merits of Delitzsch's work, it is here our purpose to speak merely of the points in which it seems not quite to meet all the expectations and requirements of Assyrian students. Some of the objections raised will no doubt be disposed of in subsequent parts of the Lexicon. It may be that we do not fully understand the principles which have guided Delitzsch in his great work, especially as, so far, he has not published a preface. But even if Delitzsch should make all possible concessions to his critics and fellow-workers, he would hardly be able to conform with their wishes in the following particulars:

1. It must be admitted that the publisher cannot be expected to place at a lower figure the price of so expensive a publication; but, nevertheless, the price is too high. Although subscribers are to receive a liberal discount, the completed work will cost at least a hundred dollars, and thus these valuable stores of learning will be placed out of the reach of the majority of students.

2. Delitzsch himself says, in his suggestive *Prolegomena* to a new Hebrew and Aramean Lexicon of the Old Testament (§ 2), that "perspicuity is the fundamental principle of all lexicography." Delitzsch certainly has a just claim on our admiration, inasmuch as, to publish the work with all attainable correctness, he did not shrink from undertaking the laborious task of autographing more than "sixteen hundred large quarto pages;" but an autographic reproduction, be it ever so carefully and beautifully executed, can never present as clear and pleasing an appearance as a printed page. And this inevitable lack of perspicuity is further increased by Delitzsch's attempt, most praiseworthy in itself, to employ his space to the utmost advantage, by making a limited use of paragraph divisions. Lengthy observations, moreover, and extensive reproductions of unpublished texts are interspersed throughout, thus increasing the bulk and necessarily detracting from the perspicuity. We freely grant that these valuable additions are absolutely indispensable; but it would certainly be better to make of them a separate publication.

3. The internal arrangement might also call forth dissenting opinions. Delitzsch no doubt endeavored to be as scientific as possible, but we venture to say that his disposition of the material is hardly the most practical. Nor will all students of Assyrian subscribe to his opinion that it would have been a waste of space to mention in every case the corresponding forms of the cognate languages. Finally, while it is most gratifying to learn that Delitzsch entertains the idea of appending printed notes in which due credit will be given to each of his predecessors and fellow-workers in the field of Assyrian lexicography, still it might have been

more advisable to embody these notes in the main work, at least as far as recent Assyriological publications are concerned.¹

Bearing these various points in mind, no one will be surprised that the first part of Delitzsch's work has not met with general approval. The severe criticisms, however, and savage attacks published in recent journals are altogether unjustified. On the other hand, even the warmest friends of Delitzsch cannot deny that the first fascicle does not fully meet all the wants of Assyrian students, especially of beginners. Consequently it is not unlikely that other Assyriologists will publish their lexicographical collections hitherto withheld owing to the announcement of an Assyrian Thesaurus compiled by the famous Leipzig cuneiformist. Every Assyriologist has, of course, some collection of words and forms. Even the beginner must commence a compilation for his own use. There is small doubt that several Assyrian glossaries would have been published before now, had not everyone been awaiting the long announced work of Delitzsch. It is hardly necessary to state that we have not the slightest intention of taking sides with Delitzsch's opponents, such as "Bél-ibnî" and other anonymous critics. Nor have we any desire to supersede Delitzsch's grand Thesaurus; still we believe that there is room for another lexicographical work, more serviceable and more within reach of the average student, though less ambitious in its aim.

The Semitic Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, therefore, proposes to compile an Assyrian-English Glossary, the distinctive features of which will be as follows :

(a) It shall not exceed a certain limited bulk, about that, say, of the Davies-Mitchell Hebrew-English Lexicon, a volume which in point of convenient size and clear print can serve as a model.

(b) The price will be as small as possible, at most five dollars. It will thus be within the reach of every student of Assyrian.

(c) In order to keep within these limits, a system of abbreviations will be used, so that references to authors and works will occupy the least possible space, discussions of doubtful words or readings being reserved for special papers.

(d) Prof. Haupt has repeatedly remarked that Assyriologists should as soon as possible remove the cause of the reproach, not unjustly brought forward by Prof. Paul de Lagarde, of the "unhistorical" character of cuneiform research.² Many words whose stems or meanings later scholars fancy that they have determined were already well known and established by older men, such as Hincks and his contemporaries. For instance, the correspondence between Syriac *madattâ* and Assyrian *madattu*, 'tribute,' was first established by Hincks in his paper on the Khorsabad Inscriptions, published as early as the year

¹ Under *igaru*, e. g., p. 113 Delitzsch ought to have cited Sayce's and Pinches' remarks, ZK. ii. pp. 257 and 346.

² Cf. *Hebraica*, vol. iii. p. 269, and Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, i. 63 (Göttingen, 1884).

1850.³ The compilers will, therefore, make a special point of giving full references to Assyriological publications.

This, of course, necessitates a division of labor. Dr. Cyrus Adler will give particular attention to recent literature, and Mr. Edgar P. Allen will make the historical development of Assyrian lexicography his special study. The whole work, it is needless to say, will be carried on under the direction of Prof. Paul Haupt, whose lexicographical collections will form the basis of the undertaking.

(e) In all cases where indubitable connection with sister idioms can be established, the corresponding forms will be given, to help beginners in Assyrian, and at the same time to furnish specialists in the cognate languages with a certain control over the statements made in the glossary.

(f) The arrangement of the material will be both as practical and as scientific as possible. All derivatives will be treated of under their respective stems. The verbal stems will be placed first, followed by verbal derivatives, then by nominal derivatives, first the *formae nudae*, i. e., forms made by internal vocalic change, without addition of formative elements; and second, *formae auctae*, i. e., forms made by prefix, by infix, by affix, and by prefix and affix together. But, in order to facilitate the finding of words, especially of derivatives from feeble stems, all words, as also the more frequently used conjugational forms, will be cited also in alphabetical order, with appended references to their stems. This arrangement has two advantages: a survey will thereby be obtained of classes of words formed by the same prefix, and also an idea of the relative frequency of certain formations; it will, besides, be especially convenient for words whose stems are a matter of doubt.

The stems will be expressed in Hebrew letters. There will be no cuneiform characters used; Hebrew and Syriac words cited will be written in Hebrew; while Arabic and Ethiopic, as well, of course, as Assyrian, will be transliterated in Roman characters.

The abbreviations spoken of above will be printed in bold-face and in black-letter type, the former for grammatical terms and the latter for references to authors and their works. The greatest possible clearness will thus be insured.

(g) The arrangement of consonants will be according to the system first indicated by Prof. Haupt, and followed by Delitzsch in his Dictionary: that is, all initial gutturals will be cited under **𐤀**, distinguished as **𐤀₁**, **𐤀₂**, **𐤀₃**, **𐤀₄**, and **𐤀₅**. There is no evidence that the Assyrian language had any other guttural than **𐤀**. For example, words like *abu*, 'father,' *alâku*, 'to go,' *alîbu*, 'milk,' *aqrabu*, 'scorpion,' and *âribu*,

³ See *On the Khorsabad Inscriptions* by the Rev. Edward Hincks, D.D. (from the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxii., Part II.—Polite literature), Dublin, 1850, p. 42, foot-note.

'raven,' which begin in Arabic with five different consonants, appear in Assyrian under one—the **N**.⁴

Although by this arrangement the number of words treated of under the first consonant will constitute about one-fourth of the whole glossary, this disproportion⁵ is unavoidable, since any other arrangement would be unscientific.

In one respect the arrangement will differ from that followed by Delitzsch. Though Prof. Haupt was the first to point out the reasons for putting initial **ʾ** and **ʿ** under **ʾ** and **ʿ** in their respective places according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet,⁶ he has since come to the conclusion that these reasons, subsequently adopted by all Assyriologists, do not hold good, and consequently initial **ʾ** and **ʿ** will be placed under **N**, distinguished as **N**₆ and **N**₇. There is no evidence that consonantal **ʾ** and **ʿ** existed in primitive Shemitic. Their development in *anlaut*, as opposed to **N**, may be secondary. (Cf. ZA. ii. 279.)

There must also be an **N**₈, corresponding to original *m*, and **N**₉, corresponding to original *n*, as in *itaplusu* for *nitaplusu*.

We hope to further the work as energetically and as rapidly as possible. The preparing of the manuscript for publication will form a principal part of the work of the Semitic Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University during the coming session. The first edition will, of course, in a manner be tentative—a basis for fuller and more complete work which we may expect to embody, in the course of time, in a larger second edition.

We may say that the Baltimore Assyriologists are in good position to do their work—so far, at least, as material is concerned. The Johns Hopkins University has lately purchased a very important Assyriological collection, belonging to the library of one of the most distinguished Oriental scholars in Europe, consisting in early Assyriological publications, pamphlets, and even newspaper clippings of considerable value and now almost inaccessible at any other place. Whatever, again, may be wanting in the University library will be made up by the large private collection of Prof. Haupt. In addition to this, Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward, one of the pioneer Assyriologists of America, has kindly offered to place at our disposal his unique collection of early Assyriological publications.

The usefulness of such a glossary as we propose is obvious, and the need of it is pressing. Even if Delitzsch or some other Assyriologist in Germany should supplement his Thesaurus by a glossary compiled according to our principles set forth above, the Johns Hopkins glossary would still better commend itself to English speaking students, who must

⁴ Cf. Haupt, SFG., 10; 20, 3; KAT² 492 and 522; Francis Brown, *American Journal of Philology*, vol. iv, p. 343.

⁵ This seems to militate against the opinion that the **N** in Assyrian instead of the Arabic **ن ح ع ه** is more primitive.

⁶ Cf. Haupt, *Sumerische Familiengesetze*, p. 48, n. 3.

much prefer to study Assyrian through the medium of their own language, rather than through a foreign medium like German, especially as the language of certain German Assyriologists is more obscure than the cuneiform hieroglyphics themselves, and sometimes only to be understood by referring to the original texts.

17. Prolegomena to a Comparative Assyrian Grammar; by Prof. Paul Haupt, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

§ 1. Assyrian, or more accurately speaking Assyro-Babylonian, is the name of the Semitic language found on the cuneiform tablets of Nineveh and Babylon, as well as in the trilingual Achæmenian inscriptions of Persepolis, Behistûn, Hamadân, etc.

§ 2. The inscriptions of the Achæmenian kings (Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, I.-III.) are composed in three different languages :

a. The first place is occupied by the official language of the Persian empire, the so-called *Old Persian*, whose decipherment by Geo. F. Grotefend, in 1802, laid the foundation of all cuneiform research.

b. Then comes the so-called (*Scythian* or) *Susian* version in the agglutinative idiom of Susiana (called also Elamitic, Median, Anzanian, and Amardian), and said to be related to Georgian.

c. And finally, the *Babylonian* version in the Semitic language of the ancient Mesopotamian empire.

§ 3. Also in the cuneiform tablets disinterred in the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris we find a variety of languages; several of these texts exhibit, alongside of Assyrian, a non-Semitic idiom, apparently the language of the pre-Semitic aborigines of Chaldea, who founded the civilization of Western Asia, and invented the cuneiform system of writing.

This so-called *Proto-Chaldean* has come down to us in two distinct forms: in one of them, chiefly magical formulæ and incantations are composed; in the other, hymns and penitential psalms. The latter is designated, in the ancient cuneiform vocabularies of the Assyrian national grammarians, by the technical term *eme sal*, generally rendered 'female language,' or 'woman's language.' Some Assyriologists are of the opinion that the so-called "woman's language" was the dialect of Shumer (the biblical שִׁנְאָר *Shinâr*), or South Babylonia; the idiom of the incantations, on the other hand, being the dialect of Akkad (mentioned in the genealogical tablet, Gen. x.10)¹ or North Babylonia. Others consider the incantations South Babylonian or Sumerian, and the penitential psalms Akkadian or North Babylonian. And recently the view has been advanced that these two species of Proto-Chaldean do not represent a local but a temporal variation. Accordingly, what we have been accustomed to term Sumerian and Akkadian is now spoken of as Neo-Sumerian and Old Sumerian, the so-called woman's language being regarded as a later development of the idiom of the incantations (Z.A. II. 200,1).² We cannot boast, therefore, of our investi-

gations in that line having yielded any results which have met with general acceptance. Even the existence of a non-Semitic idiom beside the Assyro-Babylonian is denied by several distinguished cuneiformists. It seems to me, however, that the theory of a pre-Semitic population in Chaldea is established beyond all doubt.³

Whatever the relations of the various forms of the Proto-Chaldean language may be, they certainly have no direct bearing on Assyrian grammar. Nor need we consider the controversy concerning the alleged affinity of Sumero-Akkadian and the Ural-Altaic languages (JRAS. vol. XVIII., part 3). In the following remarks we will briefly designate the non-Semitic idiom of the Mesopotamian cuneiform texts as Akkadian, just as we comprise the Semitic language of both the Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions under the name Assyrian.

§ 4. The literature of Assyrian embraces a period of forty centuries. The latest cuneiform inscription is a small terra-cotta tablet, preserved in the Zurich Museum, containing a bond dated Babylon, in the month of Kislev, 3d day, 5th year of Piḫariš, king of Persia, i. e., according to Jules Oppert (RP. XI. 105), Pacorus II. (Πάκορος), a contemporary of the emperors Titus and Domitian. Pacorus' accession to the throne took place in the year 77 after Christ. Accordingly the date given on the tablet corresponds to December, 81, of our era.⁴

The test inscription of any length is a terra-cotta barrel-cylinder of Antiochus I., Σωτήρ (born 323, †261 B. C.), son of Σέλευκος ὁ Νικάτωρ and the Sogdianian princess Apama. It was discovered at the Birs Nimrūd, and contains in two columns fifty-nine lines of archaic Babylonian writing. The opening of this interesting inscription reads as follows: Anti'ukusu, šarru rabû, šarru dannu, šar kiššati, šar Bâbîli, šar mâtâtî, zânin Esagil u Ezida, aplu ašaridu ša Silûku, šarri, Mâkadunâ'a, šar Bâbîli, anâku, which means, "Antiochus, the great king, the mighty king, king of the universe, king of Babylon, king of the provinces, embellisher of (the temples) *Esagil* and *Ezida*, first-born of King Seleukos, the Macedonian, king of Babylon, am I." Also Antiochus' step-mother and consort, Queen Στρατωνίκη, cuneiform As-ta-ar-tu-ni-ik-ku, i. e., Astartunîku, and their son, Seleukos, are mentioned at the end of the inscription.⁵

§ 5. The earliest known cuneiform text, in Semitic Assyro-Babylonian, is a short votive inscription of King Sargon, of Agade (i. e., אַכַּד), who reigned about 3800 B. C. The inscription is carved on a small egg-shaped piece of marble, pierced lengthwise, brought to light by Hormuzd Rassam at Abu-Habba, the site of the ancient Sippar (סַפְּרַיִם).⁶

According to Mr. Pinches it is the oldest object in the collection of the British Museum. The legend reads as follows: Šargâni, šar âli, šar Agade, ana il Šamaš in Sipar amûru, i. e., "I, Sargon, the king of the city, king of Agade, have dedicated (this) to the Sun-god of Sippar."⁷ The date 3800 is derived from the famous cylinder of

Nabonidus, found by Hormuzd Rassam in the ruins of Sippara (Abu-Habba) in the year 1882, now published V R. 64. Nabonidus tells us there that, at the restoration of the ancient temple of the Sun, in Sippar, he searched for the original foundation stone. He had the earth excavated to a depth of eighteen cubits; and there, says the king, Šamaš (the Sun-god) showed me the original foundation stone of Sargon's son, Narâm-Sin, which none of my royal predecessors had seen for 3200 years. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, and father of Belshazzar, reigned from 555-538 B. C. Consequently we obtain for Narâm-Sin the date 3750 B. C., and for Sargon, his father, about 3800 (PSBA., v, 12; ZK. II, 358). The latter is the same prince of whom it is related, on a tablet preserved in a Neo-Assyrian copy, that his mother exposed him on the banks of the Euphrates in a basket of bulrushes pitched with asphalt.⁸ This interesting autobiographical sketch is, as I remarked, handed down to us only in a later copy; the short votive inscription on the marble oval, however, is an original contemporary document, written at the time of Sargon I., about 3800 B. C.—the oldest monument of Semitic speech.

§ 6. The king mentioned under the same name in the Old Testament (סַרְגִּון, Isa. xx.1) is Sargon II., Assy. Šarrukenu arkû, the conqueror of Samaria⁹ and father of Sennacherib, grandfather of Esarhaddon. He reigned about 3000 years later, from 722-705 B. C.

While the votive inscription of Sargon I. represents the oldest monument of Assyrian speech, the accession of Sargon II. inaugurates what may be called the golden age of Assyrian literature. The reign of the Sargonidian dynasty—Sargon, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon,¹⁰ and Sardanapalus—from the accession of Sargon II., in the year 722, down to the fall of Nineveh, in the year 606, is the most flourishing period of Assyrian literature. Most of the cuneiform monuments which have come down to us belong to this time. Especially under the last great Assyrian king, Sardanapalus (mentioned as אֲסַנְפֶּר, Ezra iv.10), particular attention was paid to literature: ancient tablets in Assyria and Babylonia were carefully collected, copied, transcribed, translated, and explained, and formed into a great library in the palace at Nineveh, which Hormuzd Rassam, under the auspices of Sir A. H. Layard, rescued from the ruins of ages. The majority of the Assyrian literary monuments thus far brought to light, especially non-historical inscriptions, owe their origin to this source.

§ 7. The correctness of the chronological statement in the inscription of Nabonidus, concerning the date of Sargon's son, Narâm-Sin, may be open to doubt. The fact that Assyrian literature comprises the oldest Semitic documents, remains nevertheless. We possess an inscription eighty lines in length, of an ancient Assyrian king, Ram mân-nirârî I., whose date must be fixed at about 1300 B. C., at the latest.¹¹ We have the great octagonal clay prism of Tiglathpileser I. (containing almost 1000 lines), who, according to the statement of the Sennacherib

inscription on the rock of Bavian, reigned 418 years before the Babylonian expedition of Sennacherib, undertaken in the year 690 ; so that his date must have been about 1110 B. C. (Lotz, p. v). In the Old Testament, on the other hand, we hardly have any portions reaching beyond 1000 B. C.¹² At any rate the assumption of a greater antiquity for any of these is not as well founded as is the date of 3800 for Sargon I.

§ 8. The great age of Assyro-Babylonian literature, however, does not justify the conclusion that the language of these monuments exceeds the cognate idioms in antiquity. Edward Hincks called Assyrian the oldest and best developed branch of the Semitic family of speech, giving it the name of the *Sanskrit of the Semitic tongues*.¹³ The propriety of this designation may be questioned. At any rate it must be admitted that primitive Assyrian stands much nearer, both in its phonic and morphological material, to the parent speech than even classical Arabic. The forms of the language, as preserved on the extant monuments, arose under the influence of a few characteristic phonetic laws, and can be easily traced back to the parent Semitic stage. The inflections in Assyrian are certainly far more primitive than in any of the cognate idioms.

§ 9. Next to Assyrian among the sister tongues stands Ethiopic or Geez. Common to both are, e. g.:

a. The absence of an article.

b. The preservation of the oldest Semitic verb-form, the Imperfect Qal with accented "á" vowel between the first and second stem-consonants ; e. g., Assy. išábir *he breaks*, Geez isábêr.¹⁴

c. The masculine plural ending "-âni;" e. g., Assy. belâni *lords*, Geez bâ(')lân, originally ba'lâni.¹⁵

d. The termination "-â" for the *tens*; e. g., Assy. ešrâ *twenty*, šilâšâ *thirty*, erba'â *forty*, = Geez ešrâ, šalâšâ, arbê'â,—accent in all these cases being on the final "â."

e. The ending "-â" for the 3 pers. fem. plur.; e. g., Assy. labšâ *they are clothed* = Geez labsâ; Present and Imperfect, išabirâ, išbirâ = Geez isabêrâ, iësbêrâ.¹⁶

f. The termination "-ku" for the first person singular of the Perfect, generally called "Permansive" in Assyrian grammar; e. g., Assy. išâku *I have* (𐎶𐎵), palhaku *I fear*; Geez gabârkû *I made*, labâskû *I was clothed* (cf. SFG. 53).

g. The epenthesis of the "i" in the Imperfect of the intensive stem; e. g., urepiš *I enlarged*, for urâpiš, urappiš (SFG. 63,2); Geez ifêšëm, iëfêšëm *he completes*, for iufâšim, iufassim.¹⁷

h. The emphatic "-ma;" e. g., Assy. kî šâšu-ma or kî-ma šâšu *like him*; Geez kamâhû-ma (ASKT. 195).^{*} This "-ma," which also

^{*} I should like to raise the question here whether it is not possible that the appended -ma in the Arabic Vocative allâhûmma *O God* represents the same emphatic particle.

appears in the shortened form “-m,” the so-called “mimation,” serves at the same time as enclitic copula, just as Amharic “-m,” which corresponds to Ethiopic “-ma,” is used both as emphatic particle and in the sense of Latin *que*; e. g., Assy. ina eṭūti ašbâ labšâ-ma kî-ma iššûri šubât kappe *in darkness they dwell and are clad like birds in feathered garments* (SD. 518); aptî nappašâ-ma urru imtâqut elî dâr appî’a *I opened an air-hole* (נפש, Arabic منفس manfas) *and the light fell upon my face*.

i. The use of the suffix pronoun in adverbial expressions, as Assy. ittâlak šaltîš *he marched victoriously*, Geez ḥôra tēkûzû *he went away grieved* (SFG. 36,2).

k. The use of the possessive suffix as a demonstrative pronoun; e. g., Assy. amelušû *that man*, like Geez beesîhû, or Assy. ina ûmi-šu-ma *at that time*, Geez ba’âmâtîhû *in that year* (CV. xxxvi).

l. Finally, a considerable number of words are common to both Assyrian and Ethiopic; e. g., kišâdu *neck*, plur. kišâdâti = Geez kēsâd, plur. kēsâdât (SFG. 28,1); zunnu *rain* (for zunmu, JI. 46) = Geez zēnām; igaru *cultivated land* (SFG. 35 below) = Geez hagar (cf. South Arabic هجر); mumâ’iru (= *mumahhiru) *master, commander* (Senn. v. 70) = Geez mamēhhēr *magister*; kidînu *client*, from kadânu *to protect* = Geez kadána;† ešidu *area* (syn. ḥamâmu *sphere*, Sb 272; cf. Del. Koss. 72) = Geez ‘āšad; ebištu (or, with partial assimilation of the “b” to the following “g,” epištu) *deed*, especially *evil deed* (*facinus*) = Geez abbasâ *crime* (stem עבש; cf., however, ZA. II. 354,1); mutu *husband* = Geez mēt (cf. מתי); išātu *fire* = Geez ēsât (cf. Syr. iššâtâ *fever*, SFG. 47,2); mušitu *night* = Geez mēsêt *evening* (cf. مساء and KAT² 508); dadme (stem דרם) *districts* (NLA. 60,1; HA. 59) = Geez adiâm (stem רים); šelûtu *hostility* (V R. 3,123) = Geez šal’ē; daqâqîtu or duqâqû *childhood* (syn. šihhîrîtu, i. e., צערות, II R. 36,50) = Geez daqîqnâ; tulû *breast* (prop. *protuberance*, cf. tilu *hill*, and šîrtu *breast*, fem. of šîru *high*) = Geez talâ’ (ZDMG. xxxiv. 761,1); âkîlu *wolf* (II R. 6,3; syn. zîbu) = Geez takuēlâ; šâbu *warrior* (for šab’u) = Geez ḍabbâ’i (ضبا, cf. צבא);‡ amâru *to see* = Geez ammâra *to show*; ruttû (Imperfect

† Dr. Alfred Jeremias, in his interesting little book on *Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 83, n. 3, translates kidînu by *Knecht*, deriving it from a stem kadânu *to lead into captivity* (?).

‡ Cf. also the Amharic zemb, which exactly corresponds to the Assyrian zumbu = zubbu *fly* (JI. 45; BAL. 89,1); and Geez uēšb, plur. aušâb *earrings*, (stem צב, or rather وصی) = Assyrian anšabtu (II, 40,40) or inšabtu (stem נצב *infigere*) in the same meaning (BAL. 94,3), plur. in the “Descent of Istar,” inšabâti (cf. col. I, 45 and col. II, 44, inšabâti ša uzneša *the earrings of her ears*). But the most striking instance, it seems to me, is the Ethiopic word bēnât *tribute*, which is evidently identical with Assy. biltu, constr. bilat, from abâlu

urattî) to erect = Geez arté'a; şullulu to launch (Pael from şalâlu, Impf. işlal to slide down, cf. צָלַל בְּמַיִם, Exod. xv.10) = Geez ašlâla (cf. Gen. vii.18; ūa-şallâlat iĕ'ētî tâbôt lâ'la mâi, Dillm. ed. p. 14, Greek ἐπεφέρετο); şanânu to compete (Impf. اِنْتَعَلَ: aštânan or altânan, *I fought*) = Geez tasannâna; takâlu to be stable or firm (cf. Del. *Parad.* 144) = Geez takâla (cf. Aram. תָּכַל to trust = Assy. ittakil *he trusted*, for *intakil, Inf. natkulu); nazâzu to stand (Şaphel şûzuzu to erect) = Geez nâzâza to try to raise, to comfort (KAT² 511; cf. זָקַף בְּנוֹפִים, ψψ 145,14 and 146,8, *he raises them that are bowed down*); ragâmu to cry (cf. Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, II. 177)¹⁸ = Geez ragâma to curse (prop. *beschreien*; cf. جيم); hulluqu to destroy (Pael of ḥalâqu to flee, KAT² 503) = Geez aḥlâqa (cf. حَلَقَ ḥáliqa); mâ'u to be strong, powerful (LOP. I. 197) = Geez mô'a to conquer; sapânu to overpower (SFG. 74) = Geez safâna (Amharic šanâfa to triumph); nubbû (Imperfect unabbî, unabbî) to speak = Geez nabâba (cf. נָבַא for נִבְּא "προφητεύειν"); barû to shine = Geez bārha; šabâtu to beat (cf. Targumic שָׁבַט) = Geez zabâṭa (with partial assimilation of the initial sibilant to the following "b;" cf. LOP. I. 197); "ā" not (= *aia) or "e" (SFG. 76) = Geez "i" (cf. אֵ, Job xxii.30); "-nu" *ne* (e.g., mî-nu *how?* V R. I;122) = Geez "-nû" (e.g., ĕfô-nû?); "-nî" *also* (e.g., iqábûši-ni *they call her also*, Pogn. *Bav.* 109) = Geez "-nî"; "-û" *nonne* (e.g., anâkû *am I not?* = anâkû + hû) = Geez "-hû" (CV. XL); ištu¹⁹ *from* = Geez uĕsta *in*; šu'ātu *this* = "š" + Geez ūĕ'ētû, fem. ši'âtî = "š" + Geez iĕ'ētî (SFG. 33.4) etc., etc.

To be sure, so far as the vocabulary is concerned, Assyrian exhibits infinitely more numerous coincidences with the North Semitic languages, Aramean and Hebrew, especially with Aramean. This is quite natural, considering the contiguity of their respective territories. But it does not by any means involve an especially intimate connection between Assyrian and Northern Semitic, let alone an original community of life, as Delitzsch would have it (HA. 21; cf. ZDMG. XL. 731,2). There is no evidence of these languages having ever formed an historically distinct group as opposed to the other branches of the Semitic family. Nor do the above-cited points of agreement between Assyrian and Ethiopic justify the assumption of a closer relationship between these two extremes of the Semitic territory. All the resem-

(= *uabâlu) to bring (Hebr. הוֹבִיל) the *l* having been changed into *n*, as in Arabic صنم *image* = صَلام. It stands to reason that bēnât must be, in the last resort, an Assyrian loan-word, just as בָּלַי (for בָּלַת*) in the Book of Ezra. Cf. my remarks in *Hebræica*, vol. III, p. 107, n. 2.

blances enumerated above may be due to a preservation of peculiarities of the parent speech. It would be different if the forms *išábir*, *isábēr* could be shown to be new formations in both Assyrian and Ethiopic. Even in this case, however, the possibility of a merely accidental coincidence would not be excluded.

A closer historical community between any of the five various branches of the Semitic family of speech (Assyrian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Hebrew, Aramean) cannot be established. The reasons advanced by Dillmann (on p. 4 of his admirable grammar of the Ethiopic language) for a closer affinity between Ethiopic and Arabic cannot be considered valid in the light of Assyrian research. The difference between ח and خ e. g., also appears in Assyrian (e. g. *himetu butter*, but *alibu milk*, (Heb. חֵמֶה and חֵלֶב, constr. חֶלֶב). The difference between ص and ض is witnessed in Aramean (e. g. *צִבְעָא finger*, but *עֵנָא sheep*, Heb. אֵצֶבֶע, אֵזֶן). Final short vowels, moreover, are as common in Assyrian as in Arabic and Ethiopic. The accusative, too, is regularly distinguished in Assyrian, as well as the subjunctive or voluntative, called in Assyrian precativ. As to the stem-formations of the verb, they are as manifold in Assyrian as in either of the South Semitic languages, and the agreement between Ethiopic and Arabic in the internal plural formations²⁰ is balanced by the internal passive formations preserved only in Hebrew and Arabic—or as would perhaps be more correct to say, *developed* only in Hebrew and Arabic. In all these cases we have merely normal developments of primitive Semitic germs, no new formations, which alone could afford conclusive evidence of a special affinity. So, too, the abundance in Arabic and Ethiopic of stems with four or more consonants is only due to the expansion of a tendency in the parent speech. So-called quadrilaterals occur also in Assyrian. Accordingly a closer relationship can hardly be predicated for Arabic and Ethiopic, nor for Assyrian and Ethiopic, nor for Assyrian and Hebrew. On the other hand, we may safely maintain that, among all the Semitic languages, Ethiopic ranks next to Assyrian in point of antiquity.²¹

§ 10. The especial peculiarities of Assyrian in distinction from the other Semitic languages are

a. That Assyrian does not possess the semi-vowels ʔ and ʕ (cf. Assy. *arḥu month* = Ethiopic *uṛḥ*; Assy. *ûmu*, or rather *ômu*, *day* = Arabic *iaum*). Whether Assyrian ʔ in this case is older than ʔ and ʕ of the cognate languages is difficult to decide.²²

b. Also the two gutturals (or rather laryngeals) ה and ע appear in Assyrian as ʔ (e. g. *alâku to go*, Heb. הָלַךְ; *aqrabu scorpion*, Heb. עֲקָרַב; so too ḥ, Arabic ح (called Ḥaut in Ethiopic), the weaker variety of ח, while ḥ, Arabic خ (Ethiopic Ḥarm), the

stronger variety of **ח**, is regularly preserved as **h** (e. g. **h**anšâ *fifty*, but **em**u *father-in-law*, Heb. **חם**).

c. The common Semitic perfect form with personal affixes is only in the first stage of development in Assyrian and relatively rare. The form which corresponds to the common Shemitic imperfect serves as *tempus historicum*, and at the same time as *praeteritum perfectum* and *plusquamperfectum*; while for the present and future, the above described verbal form, with inserted accented á before the second stem-consonant, has been preserved. Accordingly, ašbir in Assyrian does not mean as Hebrew **אֶשְׁבֵּר** *I break* or *I shall break*, but *I broke* and *I have broken* or *I had broken*; *I shall break* is ašábir. So-called permansive forms (with personal affixes), like šabraku, which may mean either *I have broken* or *I will break*, seldom occur.²³

d. All Assyrian nouns end in the absolute state in *u*, *i*, *a* or with "mimation" *um*, *im*, *am*, no essential difference in meaning existing between these various terminations: kalbu, kalbi, kalba or kalbum, kalbim, kalbam all simply mean *dog*. The appended nasal is certainly not as in Arabic, the sign of the *status indefinitus*; indeed, the contrary might be asserted. The mimation is really found in many cases in which the cognate languages would use the article, thus corresponding to the appended *n* in Sabeian.*

e. Also in the verb—the Imperative and all forms with gender, number and personal affixes excepted—the final stem-consonant can take these vowels *u* and *a* or more rarely *i*: uzaqqipu, uzaqqipa (and uzaqqipi) mean only like uzaqqip *I impaled*.²⁴

f. The personal pronouns and suffixes of the third person begin with a sibilant and not with **ה**, as in the other Semitic languages: *he*, *she*, Heb. **הוא**, **היא** are in Assyrian šû, šî, pl. šunu, šina for Heb. **הֵנָּה**, **הִנֵּה**.²⁵

g. Similarly we find as the prefix of the causative stems in Assyrian not a breathing but the sibilant "š." A Hiphil or Aphel does not exist in Assyrian; only a Shaphel and the reflexive formations derived from it, the **אֶשְׁתַּפֵּעַל** and **אֶשְׁתַּנַּפֵּעַל**, or with the change of antedental **ש** into **ל**, peculiar to Assyrian, **אֶלְתַּפֵּעַל** and **אֶלְתַּנַּפֵּעַל**.²⁶

h. The form **אֶשְׁתַּנַּפֵּעַל** (or **אֶלְתַּנַּפֵּעַל**), mentioned above, belongs to the tertiary formations with infixed **תַּנ** peculiar to Assyrian. Assyrian forms, corresponding to the Qal, Piel, Šaphel, and Niphal, the reflexive passive stems **אֶנְתַּפֵּעַל**, **אֶלְתַּפֵּעַל**, **אֶשְׁתַּפֵּעַל**, **אֶשְׁתַּנַּפֵּעַל** (or **אֶלְתַּפֵּעַל**), and in addition to these an **אֶפְתַּנַּעַל**, **אֶפְתַּנַּעַל** (or **אֶתַּנַּעַל**), and **אֶנְתַּנַּפֵּעַל** (or **אֶלְתַּנַּפֵּעַל**), and **אֶנְתַּנַּפֵּעַל** (or **אֶתַּנַּפֵּעַל**).

i. Assyrian differs from the cognate languages in that it regularly

* This explains why certain words like eršitum *earth* or napištum *life* almost invariably appear with the "mimation."

infixes the formative element of the reflexive passive stems, not only in the reflexive passive stem of the Qal as in Arabic (افتعل), but also in corresponding secondary formations of the intensive stem; e. g., the reflexive to *umaššer I left*, is not *utmaššer*, but *umtaššer*, or, with partial assimilation of the "t" to the preceding **u**, *umdaššer*.²⁷

k. It is noteworthy that the feminine verbal forms of the third person with prefixed **u** are very rarely used, the form with the preformative **'**, corresponding to the third person masculine of the cognate languages, being still of common gender in Assyrian.²⁸

l. Also the prefix **u**, instead of the prefix **u** in other Semitic languages, forms a special peculiarity of Assyrian; e. g., *narkabtu chariot*, Aram. מִרְכָּבָא, Heb. מִרְכָּבָה.²⁹

m. Finally, a large number of words are peculiar to Assyrian, especially nouns, not occurring in any of the cognate languages. Cf., e. g., *balātu to live*, *kašātu to conquer*, *paḥāru to gather*, *ekēmu to seize*, *teḥū to approach*, *hepū to destroy*, *qebū to speak*; *labiru old*, *limnu evil*, *damqu propitious*, *raggu evil*; *qātu hand*, *zumru body*, *amelu man*, *ardu servant*, *šaḳū chief*, *qurādu warrior*, *zinništu female*, *summatu dove*,* *karanu wine*, *šizbu milk*, *kudurru boundary*, *kunukku seal*,† *šallaru wall*, *uknū crystal*, *palū reign*, *apsū ocean*,‡ *lamassu bull colossus*, *nergalu lion colossus*, *ekimmu spirit*, *sukkallu messenger*, *dupsarru scribe*, *dimgallu architect*, *abkallu leader*, *mahḥu magnate*, *muhḥu upper part*, *imḥullu and imbaru storm*, *iššakku priest-king*, *šakkanakku ruler*, *abarakku grand-vizier*, *mulmullu spear*, *hegallu and lalū or lulū abundance*, *kisallu platform*, *musukkānu palm-tree*, *šusšu ὠσσοσ*, *neru νῆρος*, *šar śāpos*, *paramahḥu sanctuary*, *narū stone-tablet*, *musarū inscription*, *kimahḥu sepulchre*, etc., etc. A number of these would seem to be borrowed from Akkadian.³⁰

§ 11. Although the Assyro-Babylonian monuments cover a period of almost 4000 years, we can say that the language in general appears at the same stage of development. Changes that Assyrian underwent during this long period of time are only apparent in a limited number of instances: the language of the Inscription of Rimmon-nirari I., about 1320 B. C., does not essentially differ from that of the barrel-cylinder of Antiochus Soter, about 270 B. C. The script, at least, does not betray any material deviations. There is, on the other hand, a marked difference between the language of the royal inscriptions and the popu-

* Cf. Dr. Cyrus Adler's note on *The Legends of Semiramis and the Nimrod-Epic* in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, vol. vi, No. 55 (January, 1887), p. 51a.

† In Armenian, according to Lagarde (*Mittheilungen*, i, 88): *κνιχ*; cf. CV. xxxv. Dr. Jensen, ZA. i, 254, 1, seems to have overlooked these passages.

‡ In Akkadian *abzu*. Some Assyriologists consider a *apsū* (i. e. the Ἰαπασών of Damascius) the prototype of ἄβυσσος *abyss*.

lar speech as found in contemporary private documents, contract-tablets, letters, and reports (cf. PSBA. ix., 241). The language of the royal inscriptions represents more or less an artificial dialect kept up in the schools of the Assyro-Babylonian hierogrammatists in accordance with the old traditions. The ancient texts remained for all time the classical model for all the written documents composed by the learned scribes, and the archaic style was conscientiously imitated down to the latest period (ZA. i., 350). Certain peculiarities, moreover, are witnessed in the poetical language, in the religious and mythological and the magical and liturgical texts, especially so far as the syntax is concerned. These texts are almost exclusively interlinear translations from Akkadian, and consequently the Assyrian they contain is influenced by the non-Semitic original. For the syntax of Assyrian, therefore, this branch of literature can be used only to a very limited extent. The same holds good for the grammatical exercises and vocabularies compiled by the ancient Assyrian scholars for the explanation of the non-Semitic texts.³¹

§ 12. The principal changes in the phonic material, as far as can be judged from the writing, concern the "e"-vowel, the labial nasal "m" and the two sibilants "š" and "s." The "e"-vowel (i. e., a modified "a" or "ä") was confounded in course of time as in Western Syriac with "i": for rešû *head*, emur *he saw*, they pronounced afterwards rišû, îmur, cf. Western Syriac rišô, nîmar, instead of Eastern Syriac **ראש**, **נאמר**.³²

The labial nasal "m" passed gradually into the labial spirant "v" which must be distinguished from the semi-vowel "u," English "w." Instead of Simânû, Kislimû, e. g., the names of the third and ninth Babylonian months, they pronounced Sivânû, Kislivû,³³ rendered in Hebrew by **סין**, **כסלו**; for Araḥ-šâmnu *eighth month*, they said Araḥ-šavnu, Heb. **מרחשן**. Finally, the labial disappeared entirely, like the Greek F, especially in the middle of a word, or to use the terminology of Semitic grammar, the **מ** became an **ס**; for šurmenu *cypress*, they said šurvînu, and finally šur'înu. In the same way, in a list of the Babylonian months, the name of the fourth month, corresponding to Hebrew **תמוז**, is written Du'ûzu, Dûzu, for Du-vûzu, Dumûzu.³⁴

§ 12. In the case of the two sibilants, "š" and "s," a change took place only in Assyrian, i. e., Assyrian proper or the language of the Ninevite empire. In Babylonian the two sounds remained unchanged; here the old **ש** was always pronounced "sh" and **ס** as a simple "s;" but in Ninevite Assyrian, a mutation came about, "š" becoming "s," and "s" on the other hand "š." In Babylonia, for instance, they said šamšû *sun*, and sîsû *horse*, in Nineveh, on the contrary, samsu *sun*, and šîšû *horse*. The name of Ethiopia, **כוש**, appears in the Babylonian Darius inscription of Naqš-i-Rustam as Kûšu; but in the Assyrian

annals of Sardanapalus, as Kûsu, since Assyrian "s" was pronounced as 𐎶. Similarly the Elamitic district Îâšian (in the neighborhood of Susa) is called on a Babylonian tablet Îâšian, but in the Assyrian Prism inscription of Sennacherib Ias'an.³⁵

This mutation of 𐎶 and 𐎶 in Assyrian constitutes the chief difference between the language of Nineveh and Babylon;³⁶ we can even say the only dialectical difference; for the often repeated assertion that Babylonian possessed in distinction from Assyrian a preference for softer sounds, as "b" for "p," "z" for "š," "g" for "q," does not agree with the facts. In the cases alluded to, there is no real phonetic change, but only a graphic peculiarity, occurring in Ninevite texts as well as in Babylonian.³⁷ I shall treat of this question more fully in an essay on the development of the cuneiform system of writing which will appear in the next number of *Hebraica*, April, '88.

In conclusion; I should like to state—Lagarde would say, *um keinem Gerechten in die Hände zu fallen!*—that this paper, in its unassuming form as presented here, does not constitute a specimen chapter of my Comparative Assyrian Grammar, but a mere *abstract* of the general introduction to be prefixed to that work. Several important points which could here but briefly be alluded to will be fully treated in my book now in course of preparation. I shall especially endeavor to make the bibliography as complete as possible, an undertaking which, however desirable it might seem, would be out of place in the *Proceedings* of our Society.³⁸

NOTES.

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Die Sprache der Kossäer*, Leipzig, 1884, p. 19,2.

² Cf. *Mittheilungen des Akademisch-Orientalischen Vereins zu Berlin*, Berlin, 1887, p. 6.

³ I cannot enter here upon the controversy so freely waged by Assyriologists during the past ten years as to whether Akkadian be a language or a sort of cryptography. I expressed my views on this subject in the year 1881, before the Fifth International Oriental Congress held at Berlin. I think everyone who studies my little book on the Akkadian language, published in 1883, will arrive at the conclusion that, in the so-called Sumero-Akkadian texts, we really have to do with a peculiar non-Semitic idiom. How far the Akkadian texts have been affected by Semitic influence is quite another question. We may readily admit that all the Sumero-Akkadian texts thus far known were composed by Semitic Assyrians and Babylonians, without in any way casting doubt upon the *existence* of a pre-Semitic idiom in the Mesopotamian valley. Joseph Halévy's attempt—made, as I always recognized, with great acuteness—to preserve to the Semites the glory of the foundation of West-Asiatic civilization, leads to the most curious consequences. Cf. Eduard Meyer's *Geschichte des Alterthums*, § 120, rem. Considerable comment has recently been occasioned by the fact that my learned

friend, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, of Leipzig, has come alarmingly close to Halévy's theory. I trust that this will be only temporary with Delitzsch. It seems to me that he, as we say in German, *schüttet das Kind mit dem Bade aus*. Nor can I restrain the surmise that, by the renunciation of Akkadian, so little favored among Semitic scholars, Delitzsch is trying—of course unconsciously—to ensure a more cordial reception for his Semitic assertions. Cf. Halévy, *Recherches bibliques*, p. 246. [See also Tiele's *Geschichte*, p. 486.]

⁴ Cf. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 214. It might be well to add that I was told last summer that this contract tablet in Zurich does not exist. I have written to Dr. Zimmern, of Strassburg, asking him to look into the matter at his first opportunity. [Cf. Dr. Hilprecht's remarks in his review of Kaulen's *Assyr. & Babyl.* in the *Theol. Lit. Bl.*, Nov., '85.]

⁵ Cf. Oppert's paper in the *Mélanges Renier* (Paris, '86), pp. 217–232, and Lyon's remarks, PAOS. Oct., '84, p. xvi.

⁶ For the biblical form of the name, see my remarks, ZA. II. 267, 2. Cf. also Dr. Wm. H. Ward's interesting article in the second volume of *Hebraica*, especially p. 85 below.

⁷ Cf. PSBA. VIII. 243. A careful drawing of this celebrated inscription is published, PSBA. VI. 68, and an illustration, giving an idea of the general appearance of this unique object, may be found in Budge's *Babylonian Life and History*, p. 40.

⁸ Cf. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 209; Halévy, *Mélanges de critique et d'histoire*, Paris, 1883, p. 162; [Tiele, *Gesch.*, p. 488, n. 1].

⁹ Cf. Sayce's remarks in the *London Academy* of Oct. 22, '87. The same question has been quite recently discussed by Dr. Hugo Winckler in the last number of Dr. Carl Bezold's *Journal* (ZA. II., 351). I cannot suppress the remark, in this connection, that I was really amazed at reading such truculent language in the peaceful columns of the *Munich Zeitschrift*. I do not know how the editor can consider that compatible with the emphatic statement, *im Interesse der jungen Wissenschaft wird Sorge getragen, jede persönliche Polemik unbedingt auszuschliessen*. What are Oppert's remarks against Pinches, so unsparingly condemned by the *Redaction der Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung*, ZK. I., 278, compared with Dr. Winckler's savage attack! I remember that, in the summer of 1885, my calm statement (ZK. II., 267), *Im fünften Bande von Prof. Gildersleeve's American Journal of Philology*, p. 70, n. 2, *sind daran einige zeitgemässe Bemerkungen geknüpft*, as well as some similar innocent remarks, were refused admission under the pretext that they were *zu persönlich*. And now! "Bel lirimánnasi!" I will only mention in conclusion, that, if Dr. Winckler does not know how to account for the 𐎶 in Šâmarâ'in, he must have rather peculiar views about Assyrian phonology. Perhaps he does not believe that 𐎶 means "heaven," or 𐎶 "water," since these words exhibit an 𐎶 instead of the Hebrew 𐤠. Nor does he seem to be

acquainted with the passage v, 8, 124. I do not think it impossible that the common Assyrian name Sa-me-ri-na, i. e., according to the Ninevite pronunciation (BAL. § 12), Šâmerêna, refers especially to the city of Samaria, the capital of the *Zehnstämmeereich*; while the Babylonian form Ša-ma-ra-'in (i. e., according to the Babylonian pronunciation, Šâmarâ'in = שְׁמֶרֶן) in the Babylonian chronicle may represent עֲרֵי שְׁמֶרֶן (cf. 1 Kgs. xiii.32), i. e., the whole kingdom of Israel = Assyr. gimir or kâla mât Bît-Humrî'a (KAT². 191; COT. 181). The determinative âlu instead of mâtu is of no consequence; cf. KGF. 96. Ihtépî does not mean *he destroyed* (ibbul iqqur), but rather *he devastated*. Accordingly the statement given in the Babylonian chronicle, Šulmân-ašarid âl Šâmarâ'in ihtépî, might safely be translated, *Shalmaneser devastated the country of Samaria* (cf. ויעל מלך-אשור בכל-הארץ, 2 Kgs. xvii.5). Shalmaneser's successor, Sargon, on the other hand, is the kâsid or sâpin âl Sa-me-ri-na, i. e., *the conqueror* (Heb. לָכַר) of the city of Samaria. For the ending -ên or -în in Šâmerêna, instead of -ôn in Heb. שְׁמֶרֶן, see my treatise on *The Assyrian E-vowel*, pp. 17 and 21 below. [Cf. Tiele's *Geschichte*, p. 614.]

¹⁰ For the genealogy of the Sargonides, compare *Hebraica*, iv. 52.

¹¹ Cf. Sayce, RP. xi. 1. The inscription has been thoroughly studied by M. Henri Pognon. His work appeared first in the *Journal Asiatique* of 1883, and subsequently in a separate edition, under the title *Inscription de Mérou-Nérar Ier*, par M. Pognon, Paris, 1884. M. Pognon, who at present occupies the post of French Consul at Baghdâd, has recently published an interesting new book on the cuneiform inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, which he discovered at *Wadi Brissa*, on the eastern slope of Mount Lebanon, about two days' journey from Tripoli in Syria. Cf. *Les inscriptions babyloniennes du Wadi Brissa*, par H. Pognon, Paris, 1887.

¹² We must remember, says Paul de Lagarde, in his *Mittheilungen*, i. (Göttingen, 1884), p. 58, that the documents of the *Israelitic* language, as preserved in the Canon, extend over a period from about 900 to about 200 B. C., in the last three hundred years being composed by writers who did not speak Hebrew as a vernacular, but wrote it as scholars, in a more or less correct fashion. The remains of *Aramean*, of a relatively early date, are very scanty; the later Aramean flourished especially from 250-900 after Christ, and *Arabic* literature does not begin before 600 after Christ.—Also *Ethiopic* literature belongs exclusively to the Christian era. The oldest documents are two inscriptions discovered at Axûm, of the pagan king Tazênâ of Axûm, about 500 after Christ. Cf. Aug. Dillmann, *Über die Anfänge des Axumitischen Reiches*, Berlin, 1879, § 8, p. 220. For the Ethiopic version of the Bible, see S. Reckendorf, in ZAT. '87, 61 seq.

¹³ E. Hincks, *Specimen Chapters of an Assyrian Grammar* (JRAS.) London, 1866, p. 1. I consider the name quite appropriate, especially

if we bear in mind that Sanskrit is by no means in all respects the most primitive type of the Indo-European family.

¹⁴ See my paper, *The Oldest Semitic Verb-form*, JRAS. 1878, vol. x., pp. 244-252. It is noteworthy that, in ψ 7,6, we have a very curious Hebrew form which almost exactly corresponds to this formation,—**יִרְדֹּף אֵיב נַפְשִׁי**, i. e., iraddōf oīēb nafšî *the enemy shall persecute my soul*. The Present Qal of a stem radâpu (Impf. irdup, irduf) in Assyrian would be irâdup, iradduf. I do not mean that **יִרְדֹּף** is the same formation, but it can certainly serve as a good illustration.

¹⁵ For traces of this termination in Aramean see my treatise on *The Assyrian E-vowel*, Baltimore, 1887, p. 5.

¹⁶ Cf. the Aramean feminine plural ending “-ân,” e. g., **יִשְׁכֻּנָּן צַפְרִי**, **שְׂמִיא**, Dan. iv.18, corresponding to the fuller termination “-âni” in Assyrian; e. g., iškunâni = iškunâ; Syriac **נִקְטָלָן**, in the Perfect with epenthesis of the final “i” in “-âni”—**קַטְלָן קַטְלָן** qatā-lâni. Cf. also **נִפְלָה**, **נִפְקָה**, i. e., nēfālâ, nēfâqâ, Dan. vii.20 and v.5, **קָרִי** (Kautzsch’s *Grammar*, p. 46), and Targumic **קַטְלָא** or **קַטְלָן**, Impf. **יִקְטָלָן**.

¹⁷ Cf., however, Praetorius’ *Ethiopic Grammar*, §§ 41 and 58.

¹⁸ For **תִּרְגָּמָן** *dragoman*, Assy. targûmânû, cf. HA. 50; ZK. II. 300.

¹⁹ See Lagarde, *Symmicta*, II. 23, and compare Assy. ina in = Arabic **عن** *from*. Cf. also Del., *Prol.*, 141 below, and KAT². 498.

²⁰ For traces of this formation in Hebrew, cf. W. H. Salter Brooks, *Vestiges of the Broken Plural in Hebrew*, Dublin, ’83; and Wilhelm Jenrich, *Der Pluralis fractus im Hebräischen*, Halle, ’83.

²¹ In the past few years it has been repeatedly asserted that Assyrian is closest related to Hebrew. Friedrich Delitzsch, especially, has advocated this view in opposition to the relations between Assyrian and Ethiopic pointed out by myself (HA. 18). I believe my view has not met with general acceptance for the simple reason that there are more persons who have some knowledge of Hebrew than of Ethiopic. If Delitzsch were not the son of the great Hebraist, but the offspring, say, of August Dillmann, the great master of Ethiopic philology, he would, perhaps, substitute Ethiopic for Hebrew.—People entirely forget in the joy of recognizing the numerous alleged striking agreements between Assyrian and Hebrew that this likeness is occasioned by the fact that the literary documents of the two languages are contemporaneous. All these coincidences are due either to a direct borrowing of Assyrian words or to an independent simultaneous preservation or normal development of primitive Semitic speech. Who can say that the expressions and turns apparently exclusively peculiar to Assyrian and He-

brew, were not also in use in Aramean or Arabic dialects at the time of the Sargonides? It would be most useful if Assyriologists who spread themselves on this subject would first carefully study the Indo-European literature on linguistic affinities. Even the study of a single little book like Johannes Schmidt's *Über die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen*, or Brugmann's paper in Techmer's *Zeitschrift*, I., 226, might give many a much to be desired enlightenment. Cf. also David H. Müller's remarks in the Vienna ZKM. I., 339.

²² Cf. my remarks in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* for March, 1884, vol. III., No. 29, p. 51. My view that the semi-vowel "u" did not exist in Assyrian was misunderstood and consequently contested. I have clearly defined my position on this question in an essay published in the last number of the Munich Journal of Assyriology (ZA. II., 259). So far as I know, the statements made in this paper have been almost universally accepted. Only Jacob Barth has taken occasion (in the strange article, mentioned below, on the Semitic Perfect in Assyrian, ZA. II., 382 below) to dispute my theory. But I am sorry to say that he does not understand me. Otherwise he would not talk about the *spirantische Aussprache eines v* in cases like *سوى* and *كوى*. I certainly never dreamed of calling in question the fact that Arabic and Hebrew possessed verbal stems like *لوى* with consonantal *و*. What my remarks combated is the opinion that an Assyrian verb lamû could represent a parent Semitic *لوى*. That is something different!

²³ My theory about the relatively late origin of the Perfect was ten years ago designated as more than bold. I had only the problematic support of Dr. Hommel, of Munich (see his *Semiten*, pp. 53 and 422). However, even this revolutionary view, involving a radical change in the entire system of Semitic grammar, is gaining ground. For example, Geo. Hoffmann, of Kiel, one of the best Semitists living, has recently, in his review of Nöldeke's most excellent (but rather one-sided) article on Semitic languages in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, very closely approximated my position. See the *Literar. Centralblatt* of April 30, '87, col. 606 below. David H. Müller, of Vienna, however, in his review of Nöldeke's article, in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* (vol. I, p. 337), considers this stand-point untenable. In the last number of the Munich *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (ZA. II, pp. 375-386), Jacob Barth, of Berlin, has advanced a new theory as to the nature of the Assyrian Imperfect forms. He takes them to be Perfect forms with personal preformatives, instead of the personal affixes as found in all the other Semitic languages! I do not believe that Barth will convert many to his novel view, either Assyriologists or other Semitic philologists. If he had read Mr. Pinches' papers on the Assyrian Permansive (PSBA. v, 21-31; VI, 62-67), and my former

pupil's, Dr. McCurdy's, article, *The Semitic Perfect in Assyrian*, in the Leyden Congress Transactions (Part II, section 1, pp. 509-534), it might have prevented him from writing his essay. This would have been no loss for science, but a gain for himself. The only statement in his whole paper that really holds good is his final remark, that his results *wahrscheinlich keinen Sachkenner ernstlich beunruhigen werden!* I shall review the paper in the second part of the *Beiträge*. I will only state here that Barth does not seem to have understood my article published in 1878. I never maintained that Assyrian possessed no Perfect at all. I only believed that the Perfect was in the first stage of development in Assyrian, just as I said above, § 10, c, in the foregoing *Prolegomena*. I say, JRAS. x, 246,2, expressly: "The common Semitic Perfect is a new formation from the Participle, which has not yet been developed in Assyrian into a stereotyped tense. The Assyrian has not lost it, a few traces of it excepted; on the contrary, these apparent vestiges of its former existence are really the fresh nucleus of a form the growth of which we can watch." Accordingly Barth's assertion that all Assyriologists had unanimously denied the existence of a Perfect in Assyrian is not true.

²⁴ The forms with "u" occur especially in relative clauses, those with "a" after a preceding copulative "ma" corresponding to Hebrew forms like *וַאֲשַׁלְחָה* (cf. LOP. I, 198). Furthermore, in asyndetically co-ordinated verbal forms, the second usually takes the overlapping "a."

²⁵ We also find the sibilant instead of the breathing in Southern Arabic, in the so-called Minæan dialect, represented by the inscriptions of Me'in.

²⁶ In Hebrew we find the causative *ש* in *שִׁלְהֶבֶת* *flame*, Ez. xxi.3; Job xv. 30; and *שִׁקְעָרוֹרֶת* *hollows*, Lev. xiv.37, from *קָעַר* *שִׁבְלִיל* *snail*, ψ 58,9 (quoted by Stade, § 149), cannot be a causative formation, the Aramean reflex of the *ש* in this case being a *ת*, not a *ש*, cf. Aram. *תִּבְלֵלָא* (Del., *Prol.*, 125). In Aramean the *שִׁפְעַל* formations are rather numerous; yet a large number of them seem to be borrowed from Babylonian and Assyrian; e. g., in Biblical Aramean *שִׁכְלַל* *to complete*, *שִׁיָּצִיא* *to terminate*, *שִׁיָּזַב* *to save*. In Syriac we find, alongside of *ש* (e. g., *šamlî to complete*), *ܣ* as causative prefix; e. g., *sarhib to hasten*, *saqbil to bring against*, *saṣṣî to nurse*. These forms must come from a dialect in which *ש*, as in Assyrian, became *ܣ*.

²⁷ In Hebrew the infixed *ת* only occurs in the Hithpael of verbs with initial sibilant, e. g., *הִשְׁתַּמֵּר* *to guard one's self*. It is not impossible that all infixes in Semitic are due to a similar reason, the transposition of the prefix having been first occasioned by the peculiar nature of certain consonantal groups and having thence, under the influence of uniforming analogy, been transferred to other cases.

²⁸ This is certainly an evidence of great antiquity. Also 'in the plural of the feminine, the form תקטלנה is younger than יקטלנה. ה was originally only the performative of the second person. That the performative ' was used for the feminine is not wonderful, since the ' is identical with the personal pronoun היא she. הוא and היא, too, were originally of common gender. In Aramean, e. g., we have אבוי' his father, for אבוהו, or מלכה' his king, for *malkahi, ה' being here still a masculine suffix.

²⁹ It has recently been observed that this נ is due to dissimilation caused by the presence of a labial among the following stem-consonants. In stems without a labial the prefixed מ remained; while in stems with a labial, no matter whether first, second, or third stem-consonant, the dissimilation to נ took place, e. g., manzazu seat, from nazâzu to sit down, but narbašu resting place, for *marbašu from rabâšu to lie down. I have collected all attainable forms with מ and נ, and the rule holds good throughout. Exceptions are quite rare and always occasioned by special circumstances. My investigation on this subject is already in print and will appear in the first number of the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. I must mention here that the first proof of my article, which went to press in the early part of September, was sent by somebody to Jacob Barth several months ago, along with the invitation to write a *Gegenartikel* in the next part of the Munich Journal of Assyriology! I will take up this unsavory matter at some other place. Here I will confine myself to calling attention to the fact that we need not by any means consider the prefixed מ in all cases more primitive than the נ. For instance, in the passive Participle namkûru, which would appear in Arabic as a form مفعول, the נ seems to represent the original form. I believe this passive form نفعول, as preserved in Assyrian, is a Niphal formation. The differentiation between the Perfect (or Infinitive) Niphal (which has the form naf'ulu in Assyrian) and the Participle would then be similar to that of נקטל and נקטל in Hebrew. The מ of the form مفعول instead of the characteristic prefix נ of the Niphal, it seems to me, is based upon the analogy of the numerous participial formations with prefixed מ (= מ' someone) in the derived conjugations. We witness the same influence of uniformirende Analogie in Assyrian, the נ of the passive Participle نفعول being changed here into מ (as in the cognate languages), except in those cases where it was followed by a labial among the stem-consonants.

³⁰ Cf. SFG. 70. This principle, however, has been quite overdone. Ten years ago it was the fashion to derive as many words from Akkadian as possible (cf. *Chald. Gen.*, 273-280; SFG. 9). Delitzsch even explained gammal camel as non-Semitic (SFG. 70). Now a reaction has set in (cf. my remarks, ZDMG. xxxiv. 759); but this, too, is

going too far. In his *Assyrian Lexicon*, e. g., Delitzsch would like to explain everything from Semitic (cf. Halévy, *Recherches bibliques*, fasc. 6, p. 246)—very praiseworthy, but rather one-sided!

³¹ The syntactical peculiarities in the Assyrian version of the so-called bilingual texts, as compared with the unilingual inscriptions, afford a strong evidence for the existence of a non-Semitic idiom, beside the Assyro-Babylonian. This ought to be the starting-point of all investigations dealing with the question whether there was a non-Semitic idiom alongside of Assyrian in Mesopotamia.

³² I have fully treated this subject in a special treatise entitled *The Assyrian E-vowel*, Baltimore, '87 (reprinted from *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. VIII.3, pp. 265-291).

³³ I remarked, ZA. II. 265,2, that *kislimu* seems to be a compound like the well-known *kis libbi*. In order not to be misunderstood, I will expressly mention here that I am acquainted with foot-note 2 on p. 24 of Zimmern's *Busspsalmen*. [Cf. the Vienna ZKM. I, 199.]

³⁴ A further treatment of this subject may be found in my article on the semi-vowel "u" in Assyrian, recently published in the third part of the second volume of the *Munich Journal of Assyriology*.

³⁵ Cf. Delitzsch, *Die Sprache der Kossäer*, p. 47, n. 1.

³⁶ I have shown in the *Johns Hopkins Circulars* for August of this year that the great Irish Assyriologist, Edward Hincks (born August 19, 1792, †December 3, 1866), discovered this difference between Babylonian and Assyrian in their treatment of the sibilants *š* and *s*, as early as the year 1857, illustrating it by numerous examples. Hincks' merits have by no means been sufficiently recognized. Many discoveries ascribed to various Assyriologists go back to Hincks. I consider Edward Hincks the greatest of all cuneiformists, and it is my desire, as soon as I can possibly find the time, to set up for this really unique man a worthy biographical monument.

³⁷ Cf. my ASKT., p. 168, § 12, and Flemming's *Nebuchadnezzar*, p. 27.

³⁸ For the scanty references which I deemed necessary to insert in the present abstract, I have used the following abbreviations, most of which are familiar to all Assyriologists: ZK. is the Munich *Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung*; ZA., *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (Leipzig, O. Schulze); RP., *Records of the Past* (London, Bagster); HA., (i. e. Heb. and Assyr.), Delitzsch, *The Hebrew Language*, etc., (London, 1883); JL., Hommel, *Zwei Jagdinschriften Assurbanipal's* (Leipzig, 1879); SD., my paper *Über einen Dialect der sumerischen Sprache*, Göttingen, 1880 (GGN.); CV., my little book *Die akkadische Sprache* (Berlin, 1883); ZAT., *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ed. by Stade (Giessen, Ricker); NLA., Guyard, *Notes de lexicographie assyrienne* (Paris, 1883); LOP., *Literaturblatt für orientalische Philologie*, ed. by E. Kuhn (Leipzig, Schulze); SFG., my book *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze* (Leipzig, 1879); JRAS., *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*; ZDMG., *Zeitschrift der*

Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft (Leipzig); PSBA., *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (London); ASKT., my *Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte*, (Leipzig, 1881-82).

18. On a new periodical devoted to Assyriology and comparative Semitic grammar ; by Professor Paul Haupt.

In the early part of next year there will appear the first number of a new periodical entitled *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, and published by the well-known house of J. C. Hinrichs, of Leipzig. It will be edited by myself in association with my learned friend Professor Friedrich Delitzsch.

The plan of this undertaking was conceived ten years ago (compare the announcements on the covers of my ASKT. and Delitzsch's *Paradies*, p. 144), but various circumstances have hitherto prevented its execution. The *Beiträge* are intended as a parallel series to our *Assyriologische Bibliothek*, including my *Akkadian and Sumerian Cuneiform Texts*, Dr. Bezold's *Achæmenian Inscriptions*, with the cuneiform text of the smaller Achæmenian inscriptions autographed by myself, my edition of the *Babylonian Nimrod-Epic*, Strassmaier's *Alphabetical Index*, Lyon's *Sargon*, and Dr. Zimmern's *Babylonian Penitential Psalms*.

All works which, for some reason or other, are not exactly suited for the quarto volumes of the *Assyriologische Bibliothek* will be united in this new series of the *Beiträge*, which will afford at the same time a convenient repository for isolated communications of value and short texts of importance.

Due regard to the principles of comparative philology will be the distinctive feature of the *Beiträge*. The first number will contain among other papers an exhaustive treatment by myself of the Assyrian nominal prefix *na*, with especial reference to the theory lately advanced by the Berlin Arabist Prof. Jacob Barth (ZA. II., 111); then, the cuneiform text of the fragments of the 12th tablet of the Babylonian Nimrod-Epic, autographed by myself, after my copies made in the British Museum in the spring of 1882. Since the complete text of the 11th tablet with the Deluge episode has been published by Delitzsch in the third edition of his *Lesestücke*, we now have the whole poem in a reliable edition. This will be followed by an exposition of my new system of transliteration for Semitic sounds based upon phonetic investigations, a brief survey of which was presented to the Society by Mr. Edgar P. Allen.

Finally, I will discuss some points in Friedrich Philippi's learned paper on the Semitic sounds ʾ and ʿ, published in the 40th volume of the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*—with especial reference to my investigation concerning the semi-vowel *u* in Assyrian, recently printed in the last part (September, 1887) of the *Munich Journal of Assyriology*.

I mention my own contributions first, because they are already in print.

Delitzsch will publish a photo-lithographic reproduction of a valuable

Babylonian cylinder (*Sin-idinnam*) in his private possession, accompanied by a translation and commentary ; perhaps also a full explanation of the aim and arrangement of his great Assyrian Lexicon reviewed by Prof. Lyon at the meeting of the Oriental Society held last spring (cf. Article 16). In addition to these, Prof. Praetorius, of Breslau, will furnish a series of contributions to the comparative grammar of the Abyssinian dialects, especially Ethiopic lexicography ; Prof. Fleischer, a note on a Persian loan-word in Arabic ; and my former pupil, Dr. Geo. Steindorff, now Assistant keeper of the Egyptian Museum in Berlin—who, also, will shortly publish a Coptic Grammar in the Petermann series—will investigate anew the Egyptian names mentioned in the cuneiform account of the two Egyptian campaigns of Sardanapalus. Some of these names were discussed in the year 1883 by Professor Adolf Erman, Director of the Egyptian Museum in Berlin, in an excursus appended to my Contributions to Assyrian Phonology published in the Proceedings of the Göttingen Academy (cf. *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1883, No. 4, pp. 112–115, and *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache*, 1883, p. 88).

Our new periodical appeals by no means exclusively to Assyrian specialists. The chief stress will rather be laid on comparative Semitic philology. Representatives of this line of research, to be sure, are still fewer in number than Assyriologists, who, however, are multiplying with a really alarming rapidity. In Germany only Gustav Bickell of Innsbruck, Geo. Hoffmann of Kiel, David H. Müller of Vienna, F. W. M. Philippi of Rostock, Franz Praetorius of Breslau, and Bernhard Stade of Giessen can properly be called comparative Semitic philologists, and none of them, I am sorry to say, knows much about Assyrian. To this number may be added the name of the eminent English Arabist, Professor William Wright of Cambridge. The Nestor of Semitic Philology, Professor Fleischer of Leipzig, as also Paul de Lagarde of Göttingen and Theodor Nöldeke of Strassburg, perhaps the most distinguished Semitists living, occupy a somewhat peculiar position not easy to define in a few words. I do not wish here to indulge in petty criticism. Certainly nothing is further from my intention than to belittle the universally recognized merits of these men.

Especially characteristic of what I may be allowed to call the old school is its attitude towards phonetics, almost entirely neglected in the domain of Semitic philology. Praetorius' remark (in the preface to his great work on the Amharic language, Halle, 1879, p. vi), that the Semitic grammars contained no *Lautlehren* but rather *Buchstabenlehren*, is not unfounded. The heading of § 24 in the latest edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (Leipzig, 1885) still reads : *Veränderungen der schwachen Buchstaben ך und ם* ; and in the tenth edition of Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon (Leipzig, 1886) we read, e. g. on p. 88 : *es wechselt der Buchstabe ך mit dem härteren ם* ; p. 366 : *ם ist Gaumenbuchstabe von mittlerer Härte* ; p. 762, the editors speak of the *Übergang des Buchstabens ך in ך und ם*. Nor have the Arabists risen to an appreciation of the difference between sounds and letters. Even in the fifth edition of

Caspari's Arabic Grammar, issued but a short time since (Halle, 1887), we have no special treatment of phonology in distinction from the writing. All phonetic processes are more or less considered as graphic changes (cf. Mr. Jewett's review in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. viii, p. 361). It is gratifying to learn, however, that this is to be remedied in the next edition.

The deplorable lack of interest in problems of Semitic phonetics is no doubt chiefly due to the fact that these indispensable studies are not favored by the coryphees and leaders in the field of Semitic philology. For instance, Paul de Lagarde, as he freely admitted in his review of Hübschmann's treatise on the transliteration of Armenian and of the Iranian languages (reprinted in Lagarde's *Mittheilungen*, Göttingen, 1884, p. 144), entertains towards phonetics the greatest mistrust, inherited perhaps from his great master and patron Jacob Grimm, who repeatedly declared that at the physiological treatment of sounds *würde ihm die Luft allzu dünn* (cf. Merkel's *Physiologie der menschlichen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1866, p. iv.). I recently tried in an incidental remark (ZA II., 264) to define the difference between Aspirata, Spirans, and Affricata, adding that Indo-European linguists would perhaps wonder that I deemed it necessary to discuss these rudiments of phonetics, whereupon one of our greatest Semitic scholars writes to me, Spirans and Affricata are all one to him, since he does not demand of a technical term that it should indicate the exact nature of a thing. This, of course, stops all further discussion.

I presume there will come about in the Semitic domain a distinction between classical philologists and comparative linguists as we see it at present in Indo-European philology. Philologists of the old school will hereafter as before ignore the results of comparative linguistic research and retain the old *Zopf* of the national grammar, which, as Paul de Lagarde justly remarks (in his review of Hartwig Derenbourg admirable edition of *Sibawaihi*; reprinted in *Mittheilungen*, I., 171-174) is only of value as a collection of material. Prof. August Müller of Königsberg expressly says in the preface to the last edition of Caspari's Arabic Grammar, it would have a most pernicious effect if we should approach Arabic on any other basis; the good language, he says, should not be degraded to a *corpus vile* for the experiments of promising *Jüngstgrammatiker*—a new expression indeed to which Müller, I suppose, was helped by his colleague Bezzenberger. I consider this innuendo quite absurd. To demand of Assyriologists that they should stick to the Arabic national grammarians is just about as wise as prohibiting a Sanskritist from explaining Greek forms unless he knows the *τέχνη* of Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius Dyscolus by heart. To master the Arabic forms is not particularly difficult for an Assyriologist. If the treatises on Arabic morphology now at hand are incomplete and unreliable the fault is certainly that of the Arabists. Theirs is the duty to bring forward the necessary philological material for comparative purposes with the greatest attainable completeness and correctness. Instead of falling foul of the comparative philologists it would certainly be far more useful to pay more attention to Arabic dialectology. A

complete compilation of the notices incidentally given in Arabic authors concerning dialectical peculiarities would be a great step in advance. The *Jüngstgrammatiker* will surely not degrade this *corpus* to a *corpus vile* provided that it is not brought forth by the Arabists as a *corpus vile*.

I mention, in conclusion, that the *Beiträge* will as a rule be published in the summer but not at regular intervals. The price will be reasonable, only one mark for the printed sheet of sixteen octavo pages, though the publisher is willing to pay the contributors about \$10.00 per sheet. The time of publication will entirely depend on the quantity and value of the material placed at the disposal of the editors. Experience teaches that an obligation to print a certain number of pages every quarter does not exercise a particularly favorable influence on the quality of work thus published.

Naturally the *Beiträge* will principally contain studies of German Semitists, though other languages, especially English and French or Latin, will by no means be excluded. The editors would be most happy indeed to receive contributions from other countries, such as France, England, or the United States. I hope that above all in this country, where Semitic studies have in the last few years made such great strides, the younger workers in this field will always pay due attention to comparative grammar. It would give me special pleasure to publish in the organ of the new school a number of thorough studies from the pen of American Semitologists.

19. Animal worship and sun worship in the East and the West compared; by Rev. Stephen D. Peet, of Mendon, Illinois.

Sun worship prevailed at a very early date in different parts of the globe. It has left its traces on the early historic records, on traditions, mythology, language, and art. The very forms of the temples had reference to it, and the symbol of the sun is found in the clothing of the priests, the furniture of the temples, and the adornments of the idols. These tokens show that sun worship was a most extensive system, out of which other systems have grown. Sun worship may have been preceded by more primitive systems, but it seems to have been more powerful and more extensive than any of these. We may indeed regard it as a form of universal religion, which reached the stage of universality before historic times. We may also view it as the connecting link between historic and prehistoric times. In prehistoric times it must have existed for a long period. The change to anthropomorphic systems was evidently slow. Animal worship and sun worship were closely associated in prehistoric times, and were perpetuated in parallel lines even long after history began. The human semblance was a later development, and yet we can trace in this country the idolatry which contains the human semblance back into prehistoric times. All these types were perhaps prevalent in the East before the historic period.

I. We are to consider first the animal forms which are found in the idols of the East. We find figures composed of animal and human forms combined. These are held to be symbolic of divine attributes.

This may be so, but another view is also possible. In America animal worship preceded sun worship, and was perpetuated after sun worship was developed, and so we have the earliest and latest forms of nature worship in this country. We do not learn, however, that the animal forms which are combined with the human were symbolic of divine attributes, but we do learn that they were in a measure totemic: i. e., they symbolized the relation of ancestry which is contained in divinity, and at the same time expressed protection and power.

1. It is noticeable that the different parts of the human form in America symbolized nature powers; the eye of Tlaloc, the Mexican god, signifying that he was a rain god, etc. The serpent is found among the ornaments of his dress, symbolizing the lightning, and the cross, symbolizing the division of the elements, the points of the compass, the four quarters of the sky.

2. In America the animals symbolized were wild, while in the old world the figures were those of domestic animals, showing that symbolism was used by races which had come up out of the wild state.

3. It is common in the eastern symbolism but rare in America to find human heads on animal bodies.

4. One and the same divinity is worshiped in different Oriental countries under different animal forms.

5. Is there any historic connection between the symbolism of the East and the West? There are certain symbols which indicate that there was, though some scholars hold that these might have arisen independently in different countries. A careful inspection of the symbols representing the sun shows such marked resemblances that historic connection seems necessary to explain those resemblances.

6. The successive steps are: (1) the totem system, with animals used for symbols; (2) sun worship, with rude figures of the sun for symbols; (3) a combination of the two, including animal figures and sun symbols; (4) nature powers, symbolized by animals, introduced as an adjunct to sun worship; (5) personification of the sun, the sun being symbolized by a human figure.

These views as to the source of idolatry in America are suggestive of the source of idolatry in Asiatic countries.

II. Symbols of the sun as they are found associated with animal figures in different parts of the East. In Egypt those animals are the phoenix, the bull, the hawk, the lion, the scarabæus, the goose, the cow, the vulture. Besides those animals, the ram, the fox, the jackal, the dog, the hippopotamus, the goat, the eagle, the crocodile, were sacred in Egypt, and most of them were symbols of the sun. In India, the elephant, the buffalo, and the ox were sacred; among the Hittites, the stag, the panther, and the lion; in Assyria, the leopard, the lion, and the dolphin. In Babylonia, the vulture and the eagle were very ancient symbols.

The correspondence between the symbols of different countries deserves attention. (1) The lion is a common symbol in Assyria and Egypt, and so is the sphinx. There are no sphinxes in America because there are no lions here. But there are composite figures reminding one of

sphinxes. The significance of the lion in Egypt, Assyria, and Phœnicia is power. (2) The eagle or vulture is found in all countries. It was originally a sun symbol, but has now lost this significance. The vulture was a symbol of maternity in Egypt. (3) The winged circle combined with a human figure combines the three elements, animal worship, sun worship, and hero worship. The golden egg is to be considered as connected with this symbol of the bird. (4) The serpent in the shape of a circle represents the sun in the Assyrian symbols. In America we find no asp or serpent circle, but we find an approach to it in the bow and the disk. There is also another figure which reminds us of the human-headed bird in the sun circle of Assyria. It is found in the sculptures of Cosumalhuapa in Gautemala. The combination is different, but the elements are the same. We have the human face, the sun circle, the overshadowing wings, and the intertwined serpent.

In Egypt there were four suns, rising sun, midday sun, setting sun, and sun at midnight rest. A divinity was assigned to each of these portions of time, and a different animal represented each divinity or typified each sun. These animals were the lion, the ox, the hawk, and the cow. In Egypt animals also presided over different parts of the country. This is to a degree true in America. There we find different suns, or different animals to typify these suns. The points of the compass are also typified by different animals.

III. Transition from animal worship to sun worship, and from sun worship to a reverence for the personal attributes.

1. In America we begin with the superstitions of the savage about animals, but we end in a very high stage of symbolism, in which personal attributes are represented by the combined figures. (1) The figures of wild animals are found among the emblematic mounds of Wisconsin, protecting villages, guarding caches, etc. (2) In the mounds of Tennessee are found shell gorgets with rude and simple figures of the sun and moon but without animal figures. We have however other engraved relics which show that both systems were combined. (3) We have even human semblances in the mounds. Such is a shell gorget from the McMahon mound in Tennessee, representing two human figures, plumed and winged and armed with eagle's talons, engaged in mortal combat. (4) Among the Pueblos we find symbols of the sun attended by animal and human figures. Here we see an advance on the totem system of the mound builders. Animal worship has been lifted and combined with sun worship. (5) Mexico furnishes another stage of animal worship and sun worship combined. The four quarters of the sky are symbolized by different animals. The dragon appears. Every day has an animal divinity. The months and years are named after animals. The symbolism of Mexico and Central America is very elaborate, and shows a great advance on that of New Mexico.

2. The progress of thought is also apparent in the old world. The earliest symbols are rude, the later are more elaborate and are significant of advanced thought. The change is clear to one who compares the Hypocephali recently discovered in Egypt with the older Babylonian carved seals. As connecting links between the two we have the sym-

bols and inscribed animal figures found at Jerabis and Sindjirli. Two things are noticeable in all these symbols, whether ancient or comparatively modern: viz., the sun symbol is everywhere present, but it is attended by animal figures. Thus archæology makes a closer record than history or mythology does of the alliance between these two forms of worship. There are several stages of progress; but we have not time to dwell upon them. In closing we refer to two or three points only.

Let us consider first the bird on a proto-Ionic capital found by Dr. Ward in Mesopotamia. "This bird is evidently the symbol of the seated divinity. Before them are two worshipers, each with a hand raised in adoration. Behind them are two animals, a hare and a kangaroo (we should say ibex). The seated divinity in dress and type takes us back to the Babylonian cylinders of 2000 and 3000 B. C." Notice the dates ascribed to this cylinder and the figures upon it. Prof. Frothingham says "kangaroo." It looks to us more like a mountain goat or ibex. We have taken the position that some of the earliest inscriptions indicate that animal worship prevailed before the first ancestors migrated from their early home among the mountains of Thibet to the plains of Shinar, that they had a totem system similar to that of the North American Indians before they migrated. The hare and the ibex on this cylinder seem to confirm our position. The bird reminds us of the thunder bird of the Thlinkets and of the Aztecs, but it may have been a mere sign of royalty. The question is whether the symbols on these early seals and cylinders had reached to the stage where heraldry was adopted and understood. We think that the totem system would account for them, and yet they may be ascribed to a system of heraldry. There is another seal or cylinder in the De Clercq collection in which a bird with spread wings is represented as in the air three times repeated, with the symbols of the sun and moon beneath and seated divinities facing these symbols. Here we have heraldry, for the birds with the spread wings may have been the ensigns of power, and yet we have mythology, for the sun and moon are there and evidently were objects of worship. Layard says that "sacred birds belong to the Babylonian and Assyrian religion and were connected with magic." The progress of the totem system into the magic arts was manifest in the old world as well as in the new. The magician and the "medicine man" are analogous terms. The Eleusinian mysteries and the mysteries among the Zunis have some points of resemblance. Both came out of an elaborate system of sun worship and both were expressive of the operations of nature. We have then three stages of progress: the totem system, the primitive heraldry, and the introduction of *magicism*. There are several stages beyond. (1) The sun divinity is personified and animal figures represent the attributes of the divinity. This is the first stage apparent in Egypt. (2) After that there is an esoteric significance to the gods. Isis and Osiris and Horus are very different from Ra and Set and Neph; as different as the intellectual is from the physical. The story of Isis and Osiris and Horus is allegorical. Here we have two stages. (3) The Hypocephali introduce another stage—the

theological—or rather psychological, for the doctrine of the soul is brought in and dwelt upon extensively by these symbols. Notice, however, that the sun symbol is perpetuated as well as animal figures. These Hypocephali are divided into two parts to represent the two spheres, the upper and the lower. The boat or ark is always in the center of the sphere or disk. The soul is conveyed in the ark to the west, the land of the setting sun.

We might speak of the “survivals” in these figures, “survivals” from sun worship in the form of the disk and its divisions into hemispheres, also “survivals” from animal worship in the animal figures, but we have not time to dwell on this. Others have spoken of the universality of certain animal myths or animal symbols, such as the hare, the owl, etc., as if these were survivals from primitive totemism. There certainly has not been much progress made in these myths, and it is a question whether the hare expressed the action of the sun in its various movements or symbolized the attributes of the divinity. The Egyptian word for hare may have several different significations: ‘to start up,’ ‘to open,’ to ‘transgress or overleap,’ etc.; but what has the Egyptian word to do with American symbolism? Linguistic analogies in different countries are certainly not sufficient to account for the universality of this myth about the rabbit or the hare. Is it because the hare is everywhere found that it is taken as a tribal totem in all countries, and because it fitly symbolizes or represents a nature-power? The progress of thought may be recognized in the history of this single animal myth, for the hare itself has passed through all the stages from the simple totemism up to the psychological symbolism, and is the best instance of a “survival of the fittest” which we have on record.

20. Korea in its relations with China ; by William W. Rockhill, Secretary of the United States Legation at Peking.

The paper of Mr. Rockhill was a review of the political relations existing between Korea and China during the past five hundred years, with copious extracts from Chinese authorities.

From the *Annals of the Ming Dynasty* we learn that in 1392 Sōng Ké, the founder of the present reigning dynasty in Korea, sought and obtained the recognition of the Emperor of China. He sent in return for this favor valuable presents, and his successors from time to time did the same. China, also, during the Japanese invasion of Korea, made contributions both of men and money to her defense, prompted less perhaps by friendly feeling than by the dread of possible danger to herself in the success of the Japanese.

In the *Sheng wu chih* (the history of the campaigns of the present dynasty) is found an account, which Mr. Rockhill translates at length, of the Manchu invasion of Korea. This was in retaliation for aid given by the Koreans to the Ming dynasty, and resulted in the complete defeat and submission of Korea in 1637. An annual tribute was imposed and a tablet was erected by the Koreans at Song p'a, where the

Manchu army had been encamped, commemorating in Chinese, Manchu, and Mongol the virtue and benevolence of the Manchu sovereign.

The *Ta ching hui tien* (Institutes of the Ta ching Dynasty) furnishes data for a sketch of the relations since subsisting between the two countries. The amount of the tribute was gradually reduced, and Korea likewise acquired valuable privileges of trade with China.

An extract from the narrative of Po Chün, a Chinese Envoy to Korea in 1843, gives a detailed account of the ceremonies with which he was received.

Mr. Rockhill gives in conclusion the Chinese text and a translation of the Song p'a inscription mentioned above.

Two maps copied from native Korean authorities, one of the capital, Söul, the other of its environs, accompany the paper.

After a vote of thanks to the Johns Hopkins University for the use of Hopkins Hall as a place of meeting, the Society adjourned, to meet in Boston, on Wednesday, May 2, 1888.